DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 080 FL 007 543

AUTHOR Filipovic, Rudolf, Ed.
TITLE Reports 6. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.; Zagreb Univ. (Yugoslavia). Inst. of Linguistics.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 127p.; For related documents, see ED 096 839, ED 108 465, and FL 007 537-552
AVAILABLE FROM Dorothy Rapp, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent St., Arlington, Va. 22209 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Adjectives; *Annotated Bibliographies; *Contrastive Linguistics; Descriptive Linguistics; *Doctoral Theses; *English; Language Patterns; Language Usage; Sentence Structure; *Serbocroatian; Slavic Languages; Stress (Phonology)

ABSTRACT

The first part of the sixth volume in this series consists of a 116-item annotated bibliography of American doctoral dissertations in contrastive linguistics. The second part consists of six articles dealing with various aspects of Serbo-Croatian-English contrastive analysis. They are: "A Contrastive Analysis Evaluation of Conversion in English and Serbo-Croatian," by Zeljko Bujas; "Attributive Patterns for English Adjectives and their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian," by Vladimir Ivir; "Notes on Adjectives and Stress," by Wayles Browne; "'One': Its Forms and Uses," by Vjekoslav Suzanic; "Exclamatory Sentences with Linking Verbs in English and Serbo-Croatian," by Midhat Ridjanovic; and "Expressions of Simultaneity in English and Serbo-Croatian," by Mira Vlatkovic. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121080

THE YUGOSLAV SERBO-CROATIAN - ENGLISH
CONTRASTIVE PROJECT
Director: Professor Rudolf Filipović, Ph. D.

A. REPORTS
6

FL007543

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for Applied Linguistics
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ZAGREB, 1972.
INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb
Zagreb, Yugoslavia
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS
Washington, D. C. USA

THE YUGOSLAV SERBO-CROATIAN - ENGLISH
CONTRASTIVE PROJECT
Director: Professor Rudolf Filipović, Ph. D.

A. REPORTS
6

I Larry and P. J. N. Selinker: An Annotated Bibliography of U.S. PH.D. Dissertations in Contrastive Linguistics 1

II Željko Bujas: A Contrastive Analysis Evaluation of Conversion in English and Serbo-Croatian 41

V. Ivir: Attributive Patterns for English Adjectives and their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian 56

Wayles Browne: Notes on Adjectives and Stress 85

Vjekoslav Suzanić: One: Its Forms and Uses 89

Midhat Ridjanović: Exclamatory Sentences with Linking Verbs in English and Serbo-Croatian 103

Mira Vlatković: Expressions of Simultaneity in English and Serbo-Croatian 113

Edited by

RUDOLF FILIPOVIĆ

ZAGREB, 1972.

INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb
Zagreb, Yugoslavia
CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS
Washington, D. C. USA

Larry Selinker - P. J. N. Selinker (University of Washington, Seattle)

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF U.S. PH.D. DISSERTATIONS IN CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS

INTRODUCTION

Need for the bibliography.

The last few years have witnessed a proliferation of interest and activity in the field of contrastive linguistics. For example, several conferences, such as the 1968 Georgetown Roundtable Meeting and the 1970 Pacific Conference on Contrastive Linguistics and Language Universals, have addressed themselves entirely to this area. Large scale research projects in contrastive linguistics have developed in several countries (see William Nemser, "Contrastive Linguistics at the Center for Applied Linguistics, "The Linguistic Reporter 12.3, 1970, pp. 1-5, for a review of this activity). In addition, the first general textbook since Robert Lado's Linguistics Across Cultures (Ann Arbor, 1957) has just appeared (Robert J. DiPietro, Language Structures in Contrast, Newbury House, 1971).

Of particular interest to us has been the upsurge in Ph. D. dissertations in contrastive linguistics in the U.S. over the last several years. These dissertations are especially important since they provide a fertile source for in-depth contrastive studies. It is unfortunate that they have not become an integral part of the field and most often remain buried and unavailable to practicioners in contrastive linguistics.

This bibliography is seen as a first step toward making the information contained in contrastive dissertations more accessible. The annotations are presented to give the reader a more substantial basis for judgement than an elliptical title.

Scope and coverage.

For the purposes of this bibliography, "contrastive linguistics" is defined as a type of linguistic description which consists of the comparison and/or contrast of selected linguistic structures across two or more languages, dialects, styles, or idiolects, regardless of the original purpose of the study. One consequence of this definition is that contrastive linguistics is distinguished from contrastive analysis which, as traditionally understood, is undertaken with a view toward practical goals. Thus there appear herein many dissertations that have no practical purpose whatsoever. On the other hand, each contrastive analysis dissertation done in the U.S. should be included.

A further consequence of this definition of contrastive linguistics is that dialect studies and studies on style take on a new importance in the field. Researchers doing phonological and syntactic dialect or style studies, as they attempt to look across linguistic systems, often face similar theoretical problems as those who compare and contrast selected linguistic structures across languages. It is thus quite natural to include dialect studies under the contrastive rubric where specific statements of comparison or contrast are made. In addition, their inclusion may help shed light on these theoretical problems which remain essentially unsolved. (For a discussion of these problems, see Larry Selinker, "A Brief Reappraisal of Contrastive Linguistics,"

Proceedings of the Pacific Conference on Contrastive Linguistics and Language Universals, 1971.)

Other types of studies which converge on contrastive linguistics have been included with certain limitations. Some bilingual studies are presented herein if they contain a contrastive part within the dissertation. Comparative historical studies are included only to the extent that a modern language or dialect is specifically compared with an historical one.

Excluded specifically are dissertations which make use of contrastive information for psycholinguistic studies of language transfer and interference, but which do not in themselves contain detailed contrastive linguistic studies. Many people have felt that contrastive linguistic statements provide the best source of hypotheses for psycholinguistic experimentation related to the second-language learning process of language transfer, but it is beyond the scope of this bibliography to deal with these matters.

It is hoped that the above information will make the reader aware of our criteria for selection of dissertations in this bibliography. We have searched through all issues of Dissertations Abstracts (D.A.) up through volume 31, no. 6 (Dec. 1970)--our cut-off date. In order to locate additional dissertations not listed in D.A., the following bibliographies were consulted: William Gage, Contrastive Studies in Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1961; John Hammer and Frank Rice, A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1965; and Peter Lincoln et al., A Bibliography of Contrastive Grammatical Studies, University of Hawaii, 1970.

Arrangement.

a. General. The major part of this bibliography is a chronological listing of dissertations; the subarrangement under each year being alphabetical by author. It is felt that a chronological arrangement enables the reader to gain a perspective of changes in the field and also to sort out more current linguistic theory. Following the main bibliography are two indexes which refer the reader back to the full citations and annotations: (1) a strictly alphabetical author index, and (2) a breakdown according to languages, language families, and dialects.

b. Citations. The information for the citations is taken from D.A. or from the other bibliographies mentioned and follows a uniform format: author's name; title of dissertation; university where accepted; year accepted; and number of pages (if known). For the majority of dissertations there also appears the D.A. volume and issue number (e.g. 12.4); year of volume; inclusive pagination for the abstract; and, finally, the order number in parentheses.

c. Annotations. The short summaries which follow most of the citations are not the complete authors' abstracts in D.A., but rather are descriptive summaries which we made after reading the longer abstracts. They are in no way intended to be critical or evaluative. Since our intention has been to concentrate on contrastive linguistic studies, the annotations are summaries of the contrastive aspects rather than the dissertation as a whole. The reader should be aware that he may get a distorted view of the dissertation because of this emphasis.

Some of the dissertations contain citations only because we discovered them recently in the literature and they are not accessible to us for annotation at this time. We hope to rectify this in a future edition.

We hope that users of this bibliography will inform us of any relevant omissions. Some universities only recently joined D.A. and thus earlier dissertations may not have been included; other universities do not list their dissertations with D.A. at all. We would particularly be interested in hearing from authors who may feel that we have misrepresented their ideas.

1948

1 Craven, T.K. "Auditory Equivalence in the Phonology of French and Spanish." Harvard, 1948. (not in D.A.)

not abstracted due to unavailability at this time

1949

2 Rubenstein, Herbert. "A Comparative Study of the Morphophonemic Alterations of Standard Serbo-Croatian, Czech, and Russian". Columbia, 1949.

not abstracted due to unavailability at this time

1951

3 Berger, Marshall Daniel. "The American English Pronunciation of Russian Immigrants." Columbia, 1951. 202 pp. D.A. 12.4.(1952), p. 417. (3872)

Purpose is to compare the sound patterns of Great Russian and of American English as manifested in the everyday speech of Russian immigrants. Seeks to explain the nature of the Russian "accent" in American English.

1953

4 McIntosh, Lois. "A Description and Comparison of Question Signals in Spoken English, Mandarin Chinese, French, and German for Teachers of English as a Second Language." Michigan, 1953. 247 pp.
D.A. 13.3 (1953), pp. 341-42. (5070)

A comparison of the structural devices that signal one kind of utterance (the question) in spoken English, Mandarin Chinese, French, and German with the aim of improving teaching of English to students of different countries in the same classroom.

1955

5 Gurren, Louise. "A Comparison on a Phonetic Basis of the Two Chief Languages of the Americas, English and Spanish." New York, 1955. 253 pp.
D.A. 15.10 (1955), pp. 1849-50. (13,612)

In this comparative study of English and Spanish pronunciation, the phonetic structure of these two languages has been analyzed as follows: formation of sounds according to the point and manner of articulation; lengthening of sounds; degree and location of stress on single words and in groups of words; breadth or thought groups; and intonation. The narrow transcription of the IPA and Klinghardt's and Navarro's intonation markings are used.

6 Meyerstein, Rud S. "A Positional Determination of Semantic Equivalences in French, English and German." Michigan, 1955. 167 pp.
D.A. 15.4 (1955), p. 579. (11,327)

A discussion and illustration of various positional determinations of linguistic forms. The notions "functional determination" and "semantic determination" are defined. French units are first described according to certain formal, positional, and semantic criteria. The process is then retraced for English and is followed by a correlation of French and English structural units. Semantic criteria are then investigated to show that positional determination is independent of the type of meaning of the form involved. Finally, German forms are substituted for French to show that positional determination of functions and meanings is not dependent upon specific languages.

7 Nasr, Raja Tewfik. "The Phonological Problems Involved in the Teaching of American English to Native Speakers of Lebanese Arabic." Michigan, 1955. 171 pp.
D.A. 15.9 (1955), p. 1617. (12,628)

A comparison of the segmental and suprasegmental phonemes of English and Lebanese Arabic, for pedagogical purposes. All of the problems

predicted by this contrastive study appear in the English speech of native Lebanese Arabs, which is transcribed phonetically. No other problems are spotted.

1958

8 Kleinjans, Everett. "A Descriptive-Comparative Study Predicting Interference for Japanese in Learning English Noun-Head Modification Patterns." Michigan, 1958. 205 pp.
D.A. 19.6 (1958), p. 1306. (58-7743)

Deals with the modification of nouns in English and Japanese, compared from the point of view of a Japanese learning English. Comparison is made of the noun-head modification structure of the two languages, pattern by pattern, on the basis of the differences in three factors: form, meaning, and distribution.

9 Kreidler, Charles William. "A Study of the Influence of English on the Spanish of Puerto Ricans in Jersey City, New Jersey." Michigan, 1958. 190 pp.
D.A. 19.3 (1958), pp. 527-28. (58-3691)

Purpose is to discover the amount and nature of change in the Spanish dialect of a group of Puerto Ricans as a result of their exposure to English in Jersey City. Theoretical background is that of Weinreich and Haugen. A phonemic contrast of Puerto Rican Spanish and Metropolitan New York English is presented. Morphemic analysis of Puerto Rican Spanish reveals 10 form classes. English borrowings are assigned to 5 of these classes and proportions are given. Detailed discussion of results of borrowings is included.

1959

10 Anantham, Sundur. "A Study of the Pronunciation Problems Involved in the Teaching of English to Telugu Speakers." Michigan, 1959. 169 pp.
D.A. 19.2 (1959), p. 3299. (59-2095)

A description of the phonologies of English (RP) and Telugu, and a comparison of the two with recommendations for teaching English to Telugu speakers.

1960

11 Asuncion, Nobleza Castro. "The Phonological Problems Involved in Improving the Oral English of Iloko Speakers." Michigan State, 1960. 138 pp.
D.A. 21.5 (1960), p. 1286. (60-3408)

Purpose is to examine problems involved in improving the oral English of educated Iloko speakers. Four Iloko informants were used to provide

the linguistic analysis of Iloko phonology, and an analysis of middle-Western American English phonology was obtained. A contrastive analysis of the segmental and suprasegmental phonemes was made, comparing points of articulation, distribution, arrangement, and rhythm.

12 Kohmoto, Sutesaburo. "Phonemic and Sub-Phonemic Replacement of English Sounds by Speakers of Japanese." Michigan, 1960. 186 pp. D.A. 21.2 (1960), p. 340. (60-2545)

Predictions of degrees of difficulty in overcoming various English pronunciation problems are presented.

13 Kruatrachue, Foonfuang. "Thai and English: a Comparative Study of Phonology for Pedagogical Applications." Indiana, 1960. 229 pp. D.A. 21.9 (1961), pp. 2707-08. (60-6075)

A comparison of Thai and English phonology in order to determine the similarities and differences of their phonological systems with the aim of identifying the areas of difficulty in English pronunciation for Thais.

14 Pascasio, Emy Mariano. "A Descriptive-Comparative Study Predicting Interference and Facilitation for Tagalog Speakers in Learning English Noun-Head Modification Patterns." Michigan, 1960. 192 pp. D.A. 21.8 (1961), pp. 2288-89. (60-6919)

Procedures for comparison from Lado's Linguistics Across Cultures are followed. Categories of similarities and differences between English and Tagalog are form, meaning, and distribution.

15 Schachter, Paul. "A Contrastive Analysis of English and Pangasinan." U.C.L.A., 1960. (not in D.A.)

Aim is to point "the shortest route" to learning English by native speakers of Pangasinan. Attempts to provide a significant part of the phonological and grammatical "set of instructions" that will allow the learner to achieve this goal. The procedures set forth by Harris in "Transfer Grammar" provide the theoretical and practical basis of the study; the theory of grammar is that of Chomsky in Syntactic Structures. The study achieves completeness only to "an arbitrarily chosen level of detail", regarding the structural changes that transform Pangasinan into English. "Translation-equivalents" provide the basis for matching a given item of one grammar with a given item of the other.

1961

16 Aronson, Howard Isaac. "Morphophonemic Patterns of the Bulgarian Inflection (Compared with those of Russian)." Indiana, 1961. 216 pp.
D.A. 22.9 (1962), pp. 3193-94. (61-6922)

Purpose is to describe the following morphophonemic inflectional alternations in contemporary Bulgarian literary standard: consonantal, vocalic, vowel/zero, and stress alternations, methathesis, and truncation. These alternations are then correlated with the major grammatical oppositions in the language. The second part of the study compares the types of alternation and their utilization in Russian and Bulgarian.

17 Chaiyaratana, Chalao. "A Comparative Study of English and Thai Syntax." Indiana, 1961. 298 pp.
D.A. 22.6 (1961), p. 1986. (61-4423)

Differences and similarities between the two languages are stated in terms of syntax. Morphology, lexicon, and phonology are treated only incidentally. Chapter III contains a "contrastive picture of Thai and English in chart form."

18 Juntado, Loreto Grajo. "Number Concord in English and Hiligaynon." Michigan, 1961. 224 pp.
D.A. 22.2 (1961), p. 465. (61-2761)

Purpose is to predict interference for Hiligaynon speakers learning number concord in English. Structural descriptions of the two languages are first presented; then a pattern-to-pattern comparison is made on the basis of form, meaning, and distribution. Predictions of learning problems based on comparison were made and tested. The test results verified the predictions made.

19 Nemser, William Joseph. "The Interpretation of English Stops and Interdental Fricatives by Native Speakers of Hungarian." Columbia, 1961. 270 pp.
D.A. 22.4 (1961), pp. 1168-69. (61-3896)

Conclusion drawn from results of tests administered to native Hungarian speakers with a limited command of English: the speakers tend to perceive English interdentals as labial fricatives, to produce them as stops, and to imitate them as either sibilants, stops, or labial fricatives.

20 Sibayan, Bonifacio Padilla. "English and Ilоko Segmental Phonemes." Michigan, 1961. 188 pp.
D.A. 22.7 (1962), p. 2310. (61-6423)

Purpose is to find out which English segmental phonemes are difficult to recognize and produce by elementary school pupils whose first language is Iloko. A contrastive analysis of the segmental phonemes of Iloko (author's own description) and English (Midwest American) was made according to form and distribution. The predicted difficulties were divided into recognition and production problems, and tests were constructed for verification. The results of the tests proved most of the predictions.

1962

21 Engler, Leo Francis. "Problems in English/German Contrastive Analysis." Texas, 1962. 214 pp.
D.A. 23.5 (1962), pp. 1693-94. (62-4837)

Purpose is to arrive by contrastive analysis at demonstrations of the nature of the problems faced by speakers of American English learning Standard German in order to obtain a basis for the selection of types of drill to overcome these difficulties and, further, to suggest designs and formats for such drills. A contrastive phoneme inventory is presented. For syntax and morphology, a tabulation of 21 basic German sentence-types and their English counterparts is presented. The scheme combines concepts from three theories of grammar: the "structural slot and filler" approach, immediate constituent analysis, and transformational or generative grammar.

22 Green, Eugene. "Yiddish and English in Detroit: a Survey and Analysis of Reciprocal Influences in Bilinguals' Pronunciation, Grammar, and Vocabulary." Michigan, 1962. 257 pp.
D.A. 23.2 (1962), p. 629. (62-2733)

Studies Yiddish-English contact in the Detroit bilingual community through an account of how the phonology, grammar, and vocabulary of both languages affect one another. Informants were divided into four groups based on socio-linguistic criteria. A contrastive study of grammar and vocabulary covered the four groups while that of pronunciation only two. Data consisted of both free conversation and a questionnaire. Conclusions as to instances and type of interferences were presented with results related to specific groups.

23 Kimizuka, Sumako. "Problems in Teaching English Based Upon a Contrastive Analysis of Japanese and English."
U.C.L.A., 1962.
(not in D.A.)

not abstracted due to unavailability at this time

24 Mendoza Castelo, Lutgarda. "Structural Differences between English and Tagalog Verbs: a Study Designed to Improve the Teaching of English to Advanced Filipino Students." Columbia, 1962. 97 pp. D.A. 24.12 (1964), pp. 5398-99. (64-4302)

Purposes are: 1) to describe and contrast the verb systems of English and Tagalog, 2) to determine to what extent the differences in verb structures are reflected in the nature of mistakes made by Tagalog speakers in their everyday English usage, and 3) to derive implications for the improvement of teaching English to advanced students.

25 Sáez, Mercedes de los Angeles. "Puerto Rican-English Phonotactics." Texas, 1962. 157 pp.
D.A. 23.3 (1962), p. 1013. (62-2569)

Presents the order characteristics of the phonemes and the recurrences of certain arrangements of phonemes in English compared with Puerto Rican Spanish. The study concludes that problems of a Puerto Rican learning English result from: 1) differences in the number of phonemes and contrasts, 2) differences in the permissible sequences, and 3) differences in the phonetic expression of "similar" contrasts.

26 Satterthwait, Arnold Chase. "Parallel Sentence-Construction Grammars of Arabic and English." Harvard, 1962.
(not in D.A.)

not abstracted due to unavailability at this time

27 Siracusa, Joseph. "A Comparative Study of Syntactic Redundancy in Italian and Spanish." Illinois, 1962. 381 pp.
D.A. 23.7 (1963), pp. 2520-21. (62-6232)

An attempt to apply the concept of (non-statistical) redundancy to the syntactic structures of Italian and Spanish. The Italian text is "almost totally based" on a novel by Pavese while the Spanish text consists of tape recorded interviews with two "semi-literate" speakers of Mexican Spanish. Four types of signals provide predictive value for the form class and inflectional morphemes, the two patterns of signaled elements which appear at the syntactic level.

1963

28 Flores, Francisco Gubaton. "A Contrastive Analysis of Selected Clause Types in Cebuano and English." Michigan, 1963. 188 pp.
D.A. 24.2 (1963), pp. 734-35. (63-4953)

Goals of the study are: 1) to compare grammatical categories in Cebuano and English; and 2) to improve English instruction in Philippine schools. Descriptions employ Longacre's adaptation of the tagmeme concept whereby the tagmeme is a relative rather than an absolute concept.

29 Greis, Naguib Amin Fahmy. "The Pedagogical Implications of a Contrastive Analysis of Cultivated Cairene Arabic and the English Language." Minnesota, 1963. 205 pp.
D.A. 24.5 (1963), pp. 2023-24. (63-7926)

Purpose is to contribute generally to the teaching of foreign languages and specifically to teaching elementary Arabic to English speakers. Sources are drawn from recent analyses of English and Egyptian colloquial Arabic (Cairene dialect). In the phonemic contrastive analysis, special attention is paid do transcription, pharyngealization, long vowels, post-velar phonemes, penultimate stress, and level intonation. The structural analysis deals primarily with order, but also discusses modification, combination, and expansion of simple sentence patterns.

30 Guanco, Nelia Rivera. "A Descriptive-Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog Verbs." Michigan, 1963. 181 pp.
D.A. 24.6 (1963), p. 2322. (64-818)

Provides comparable descriptions of the verb structures in English and Tagalog for pedagogical purposes. Assumptions in contrastive analysis, such as those made by Lado, are supported by an analysis of errors in verb usage in compositions of Filipino students.

31 Ney, James Walter. "A Morphological and Syntactic Analysis of English Compositions Written by Native Speakers of Japanese." Michigan, 1963. 355 pp.
D.A. 24.2 (1963), p. 735. (63-5000)

Problems dealt with are: 1) use of the and a/an; 2) prepositions; 3) plural morphemes; 4) verb forms; 5) verbal auxiliaries.

32 Ruiz, Macario Bueno. "Weighting and Sequencing English Tense-Aspect Modifications for Hiligaynon." U.C.L.A., 1963. 410 pp.
D.A. 24.12 (1964), pp. 5401-02. (64-4436)

The study revealed that in the preparation of materials for teaching English as a second language, both the results of a contrastive analysis of the native language and English, and those of a systematic tabulation of the learner's errors should be combined. Most errors encountered were due to differences between the verb systems of English and Hiligaynon.

33 Topping, Donald Medley. "Chamorro Structure and the Teaching of English." Michigan State, 1963. 196 pp.
D.A. 25.1 (1964), p. 466-67. (64-7549)

Purposes are: 1) to provide a phonological and grammatical description of Chamorro and 2) to show by a contrastive analysis the major problems of linguistic interference for Chamorro speakers learning English. The

phonological analysis covers the complete sound system and is contrasted with English to show predicted problems. The grammatical analysis is more selective and the comparison of the two languages shows structural differences of the functors, the verb systems, and the order of immediate constituents. Examples from student papers are cited as evidence of the types of predictable errors which seem to stem from the differences between the two languages.

1964

34 Aguas, Estrella Flora. "English Composition Errors of Tagalog Speakers and Implications for Analytical Theory." U.C.L.A., 1964. 315 pp. D.A. 25.6 (1964), p. 3561. (64-12,179)

Purpose is: 1) to analyze errors that actually occur in the English composition of Tagalog speakers, 2) to illustrate correlations between actually occurring errors and the predictions that might reasonably be made by contrastive analysis, 3) to derive implications from this analysis for language learning. Chomsky's description of English grammar is used.

35 Atai, Parvin. "A Contrastive Study of English and Persian Question Signals." Michigan, 1964. 127 pp.
D.A. 25.6 (1964), pp. 3561-62. (64-12,548)

Major English question signals: word order, function words, final intonation contours. Major Persian question signals: addition of a non-falling intonation contour, question words, other function words.

36 Berberi, Dilaver. "Phonological and Morphological Adaptation of Turkish Loanwords in Contemporary Albanian Geg Dialect of Kruja: a Synchronic Analysis." Indiana, 1964. 261 pp.
D.A. 28.12 (1968), pp. 5036-37-A. (65-3464)

A synchronic treatment of loanwords, in a structuralist model, describing the phonological and morphological adaptation of Turkish loanwords into Albanian. The two languages are discussed independently and then a typological description of the phonology and morphology of the two languages is presented. The result is that the major scope of Turkish influence on Albanian turns out to be lexical rather than phonological or grammatical.

37 Dingwall, William Orr. "Diaglossic Grammar." Georgetown, 1964. 305 pp. (not in D.A.)

An attempt to determine which set of "analytic procedures" provided by linguistics is most effective in determining the relative similarities and differences when two grammatical systems are compared. The notion "diaglossic" is carefully defined and a general model of a "three-component

diaglossic grammar" is sketched in detail, with examples provided from various languages.

38 Rivera de Velásquez, Mary D. "A Contrastive Phonological Analysis of Puerto Rican Spanish and American English with Application to the Teaching of English as a Second Language to Puerto Ricans." Indiana, 1964. 337 pp.
D.A. 28.7 (1968), pp. 2668-69-A. (65-10,901)

Purpose is to compare the phonological systems of Puerto Rican Spanish and American English with the aim of providing a sound basis for the preparation of English pronunciation lessons.

39 Sebuktekin, Hikmet Ibrahim. "Turkish-English Contrastive Analysis: Turkish Morphology and Corresponding English Structures." U.C. (Berkeley), 1964. 167 pp.
D.A. 25.10 (1965), p. 5922. (65-3082)

Direction of contrasts is from Turkish to English. Based on available descriptions of Turkish and English. Includes: morphological structures, types of morphemes, morpheme combinations, derivational and inflectional morphemes.

1965

40 Anderson, Tommy Ray. "A Contrastive Analysis of Cebuano Visayan and English." U.C.L.A., 1965. 692 pp.
D.A. 25.12 (1965), p. 7253. (65-6039)

A contrastive analysis of Cebuano and English to predict difficulties that Cebuano speaking students will have learning English. Includes: description of English and Cebuano phonemes, syntax, phrase structure, intonation, transformation structure.

41 Bendix, Edward Herman. "Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary: the Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi and Japanese." Columbia, 1965. 242 pp.
D.A. 28.10 (1968), p. 4153-A. (68-5637)

An attempt to further semantic analysis by lifting the restriction heretofore imposed in componential analysis, that the subset of terms studied must first be clearly delimitable. In exploring various verbs of English and their Hindi and Japanese equivalents, components such as 'negation,' 'relation,' 'time,' etc. are used in formulating definitions and are proposed as universal semantic elements on the basis of the translatability of languages.

42 Cooke, Joseph Robinson. "Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese." U.C. (Berkeley), 1965. 307 pp.
D.A. 26.7 (1966), p. 3939. (65-13,462)

Examines usage relating to personal pronouns and other forms which like them are used as sentence subjects or objects in first or second person contexts (i.e. "pronominally" used forms). Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese are first treated separately, and pronominally used forms in each language are classified into 3 categories: personal pronouns, kintype nouns, and name nouns. A contrastive analysis of pronominal usage of the three languages reveals that despite certain contrasts, the three languages are quite similar.

43 Erickson, Jon Laroy. "English and Arabic: a Discussion of Contrastive Verbal Morphology." Texas, 1965. 159 pp.
D.A. 26.4 (1965), pp. 2198-99. (65-10,725)

Contains an analysis and discussion of Old and Modern English and Classical and Modern Cairo Arabic. The differences between the two varieties of English are contrasted with the difference between the two varieties of Arabic with a view towards demonstrating that the English differences are greater.

44 Hội, Đào Thị. "Representation of Time and Time-relationship in English and in Vietnamese." Columbia, 1965. 205 pp.
D.A. 27.4 (1966), pp. 1046-47-A. (66-2655)

An attempt to identify the differences between the expression of time and time-relationships in English and Vietnamese verb systems. The English verb system of Allen is used.

45 Radaravanija, Panninee. "An Analysis of the Elements in Thai that Correspond to the Basic Intonation Patterns of English" Columbia, 1965. 180 pp.
D.A. 27.4 (1966), pp. 1048-49-A. (66-10,314)

Purpose is to analyze elements in Thai that correspond to the basic intonation patterns of English in order to identify potential difficulties for Thai students learning English.

47 Simpson, Harold Burton. "A Descriptive Analysis of Scientific Writing." Michigan, 1965. 204 pp.
D.A. 27.1 (1966), p. 468-A. (66-6074)

Purpose is to identify and describe grammatical constructions that distinguish scientific from general written English. Morphological changes, basic sentence patterns, and modification patterns are examined. The conclusion is reached that scientific writing has developed "mannerisms" which interfere with communication. Suggestions for improvement are given.

47 Sprenger, Arnold, S.V.D. "A Contrastive Study of Peiping and German Phonologies." Georgetown, 1965.
(not in D.A.)

not abstracted due to unavailability at this time

48 Theivananthampillai, K. "An Empirical Test of Contrastive Linguistic Analysis as Applied to the Teaching of the English Auxiliary Verb System to Tamil Speakers." Harvard, 1965. 166 pp.
(not in D.A.)

Purpose is to delineate the structural differences between the auxiliary verb systems of English and Tamil with a view to locating areas of difficulty that a Tamil student would have learning English. Contrastive analysis revealed that the auxiliary verb in Tamil did not have the same crucial syntactic functions as its English counterpart; thus reported speech, conditional clauses, the passive modification, and interrogative sentences in English would be difficult for a Tamil student. Tests were constructed to validate these predictions.

49 Wakeham, Mabel Irene. "Deviations from Standard English in the Writing of Filipino College Freshmen." Stanford, 1965. 176 pp.
D.A. 26.11 (1966), p. 6709. (66-2636)

Catalogs errors made by native speakers of Filipino vernaculars who have used English only in school where it is the only language of instruction. Errors included are singular-plural problems, use of prepositions, spelling, omissions, verb problems . . . tenses, subject-verb agreement . . ., wrong use of words, and miscellaneous other problems.

50 Yarmohammadi, Lotfollah. "A Contrastive Study of Modern English and Modern Persian." Indiana, 1965. 180 pp.
D.A. 28.1 (1967), pp. 219-20-A. (65-10,914)

An attempt to discover, both in phonology and grammar, what construction patterns may be expected in English for any given set of construction types in Persian and vice versa, i.e. correspondences based on translation equivalents between the two contrasting linguistic systems.

1966

51 Alatis, James Efstathios. "The American English Pronunciation of Greek Immigrants: a Study in Language Contact with Pedagogical Implications." Ohio State, 1966. 244 pp.
D.A. 27.9 (1967), pp. 3027-28-A. (67-2402)

Purpose is to determine the similarities and differences of the phonological systems of Modern Greek and American English with the

aim of providing a basis for preparing English pronunciation lessons for Greeks. The analysis of English sound patterns is based on the descriptions of Trager and Smith and Bowen and Stockwell. The study found that some of the deviations in English pronunciation of Greeks could not have been predicted on the basis of a contrastive analysis. This fact points to the necessity for a revision of language contact theory.

52 Brannen, Noah Samuel. "The Dialect of Oomišima in Three Generations: a Tagmemic Approach." Michigan, 1966. 436 pp.
D.A. 27.10 (1967), p. 3439-A. (66-14,495)

A description of a dialect of Japanese spoken by the people on Oomišima, an island in the Inland Sea, and a measurement of significant differences within the dialect in three generations. Gives a description of syntagmemic classes following Pike's tagmemic model of description. On each level of the language (sentence, clause, phrase and word), the contrastive syntagmemes are identified, and then a detailed description of the tagmemes is given.

53 Cadora, Frederic Joseph. "An Analytical Study of Interdialectal Lexical Compatibility in Arabic." Michigan, 1966. 187 pp.
D.A. 28.1 (1967), pp. 211-12-A. (67-8224)

A quantitative analysis of degree of similarity (or differentiation) among the lexicons of the major urban Syro-Lebanese varieties of Arabic. The analytical procedure is based on a rigorously defined concept of lexical compatibility, whose application entails the use of the tools of modern structural dialectology.

54 Carlos, Lourdes Balderrama. "A Comparative Analysis of the Structure of Children's Oral Speech in Tagalog and English." Indiana, 1966. 166 pp.
D.A. 27.7 (1967), p. 2138-A. (66-12,645)

In this comparative analysis of the syntactic structure of children's speech in Tagalog and English, each Tagalog sentence pattern is paralleled with its English counterpart on the basis of translation equivalents. The study brings out the specific features within the sentence which are absent in one language while present in the other, and those features which are similar so that generalization which results in absurd transfers is formulated.

55 Eyestone, Maynard Merlyn. "Subordinate Clauses in Spoken and Written American English." Michigan, 1966. 101 pp.
D.A. 27.11 (1967), p. 3857-A. (66-14,514)

Aim is to produce an outline of subordinate clause structures which would account for all known occurrences in American English, and to determine

the relative frequency, in spoken and written English, of subordinate clauses. The study found that subordinate clauses occur far more often in speech than in writing.

56 Gasinski, Tadeusz Zdzislaw. "A Comparison of the Polish and Russian Case Systems." Stanford, 1966. 186 pp.
D.A. 27.12 (1967), pp. 4236-37-A. (67-4350)

A synchronic comparative description of the Polish and Russian case systems. Various types of case correspondences between the two systems are discussed. The methodology of the work is generally based on the semantic approach to the case analysis developed by Jakobson.

57 Otanes, Fe Torres. "A Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog Verb Complementation." U.C.L.A., 1966. 246 pp.
D.A. 27.4 (1966), pp. 1047-48-A. (66-9320)

A brief discussion of Tagalog grammar as a whole, patterns of verb complementation in Tagalog and English, and a summary of the main points of difficulty. Based on Chomsky's generative-transformational theory.

58 Verma, Manindra Kishore. "A Synchronic Comparative Study of the Structure of the Noun Phrase in English and Hindi." Michigan, 1966. 287 pp.
D.A. 27.7 (1967), pp. 2142-43-A. (66-14,608)

A systematic comparison of the English and Hindi systems of noun phrase in reference to their categorical structures, the nature and scope of the transformational operations, and their overall characteristic tendencies in manipulating the constituents of the phrase to obtain various kinds of strings. General conclusions: 1) differences in the noun phrase structures of English and Hindi are more marked in the behaviour of embedded structures; 2) the English noun phrase has a more "complex" structure.

1967

59 Becker, Donald Allen. "Generative Phonology and Dialect Study: an Investigation of Three Modern German Dialects." Texas, 1967. 148 pp.
D.A. 28.10 (1968), pp. 4152-53-A. (68-4250)

The study inquires how generative phonology may be able to contribute to the description and comparison of related dialects and attempts to assess the usefulness of dialectology in the advancement of phonological theory. A generative dialectology is built upon the generative phonologies of the three related German dialects. Rules of generative phonology may be re-ordered or written in a way to show clearly the similarities

and differences that exist in the phonological systems of the dialects. Generative dialectology, on the other hand, could further phonological theory through investigation of rule order and rule simplification factors in dialect differentiation.

60 Browning, Dorothy Ann. "Contrastive Collocational Analysis with Examples from Hindi and English." Texas, 1967. 146 pp.
D.A. 28.6 (1967), p. 2227-A. (67-14,807)

An investigation of the notions of collocation and central versus transferred meaning in relation to the task of making entries for a bilingual dictionary. Conclusions: contrastive collocational analysis should emphasize establishment of the degree of correspondence between central meanings; the data supports the native speaker's intuition that central meanings can more often be given a literal translation than transferred meanings.

61 Cohen, Pedro Isaac. "The Grammar and Constituent Structure of the Noun Phrase in Spanish and English." Texas, 1967. 220 pp.
D.A. 28.10 (1968), pp. 4155-56-A. (68-4266)

A contrastive analysis of the grammar and the constituent structure of the order classes of all prenominal and post-nominal modifiers in Spanish and English. Order classes are described in terms of their constituents, the constructions into which they enter, and their relationships with each other. A detailed synchronic and comparative description of a pedagogical and non-technical nature, with emphasis on the many similar grammatical patterns existing between Spanish and English that can be transferred from one language to the other.

62 Colhoun, Edward Russell. "Local and Non-local Frames of Reference in Puerto Rican Dialectology." Cornell, 1967. 99 pp.
D.A. 28.1 (1967), p. 213-A. (67-6414)

Linguistic systems of five Puerto Rican dialect areas are studied in terms of three model systems: 1) Standard Latin American Spanish; 2) Puerto Rican Spanish; and 3) the overall pattern of the five dialects under consideration. The study was done in order, first, to test the hypothesis of correlation with Standard Latin American Spanish, and second, to choose a satisfactory model in terms of a local or non-local frame of reference for investigating dialect variations. Study concludes that the model based on a local frame of reference (3 above) is the most useful.

63 Eastman, Carol Mary. "An Investigation of Verbal Extension in Kenya Coastal Dialects of Swahili with Special Emphasis on Kimvita." Wisconsin, 1967. 418 pp.
D.A. 28.7 (1968), p. 2663-A. (67-10,626)

A synchronic description of Verbal Extension in several dialects of Swahili spoken on the coast of Kenya. Aim is to determine the form,

function/meaning, and effect on syntax of the various particles which may be regarded as Verbal Extensions. This subsystem may be stated as being composed of two groups: 1) "Operative Extensions," a set of morphemes described on a formal, function/meaning, and syntactic basis which may be added to most verb roots/stems, 2) "Inoperative Extensions," a set of extended-appearing particles which occur in fixed stems.

64 El-Ezabi, Yehia Ali. "A Sector Analysis of Modern Written Arabic with Implications for Teaching English to Arab Students." Columbia, 1967. 183 pp.
D.A. 28.9 (1968), p. 3657-A. (68-2419)

An analysis of the syntax of written Arabic. Difficulties met by Arab students learning English are related to the differences between English and Arabic in the use of word order. The method of analysis is tagmemic along the lines of sector analysis as proposed by Allen.

65 Graves, Richard Layton. "Language Differences Among Upper and Lower-Class Negro and White Eighth Graders in East Central Alabama." Florida State, 1967. 150 pp.
D.A. 28.9 (1968), pp. 3657-58-A. (68-2917)

Purpose is to identify language differences among four groups of eighth-grade students in east-central Alabama: 1) upper-class white; 2) upper-class Negro; 3) lower-class white; 4) lower-class Negro. Two-fold analysis of written and spoken materials is made: analysis of indexes of syntactic complexity, and of selected usage items.

66 Hashimoto, Mitsuo George. "From Japanese to English: a Contrastive Analysis Based on a Transformational Model." Georgetown, 1967. 148 pp.
D.A. 28.3 (1967), p. 1064-A. (67-9465)

An attempt at applying transformational grammar to a contrastive analysis between English and Japanese following the procedures proposed by Dingwall. The study is directed toward predicting possible interferences which the speakers of Japanese might encounter in learning English.

67 Jackson, Kenneth Leroy. "Word Order Patterns Involving the Middle Adverbs of English and Their Lexically Similar Counterparts in Japanese: a Contrastive Study." Columbia, 1967. 159 pp.
D.A. 28.10 (1968), p. 4159-A. (67-16,760)

Mutually exclusive classes of adverbials are delimited in English according to Allen's "sector analysis" and contrasted with lexically similar counterparts in Japanese in order to provide lists of hypothetical

learning problems. Tests constructed to validate these results showed that the amount of interference is a function both of language differences and of type of learning structure involved in transferring prior language experience to subsequent foreign language learning.

68 Koolemans-Beijnen, Gijsbertus J.W. "A Comparative Analysis of Word Order in Contemporary Standard Russian and Polish." Stanford, 1967. 150 pp.
D.A. 27.12 (1967), p. 4238-A. (67-7933)

An attempt to elucidate the relation between form and meaning in word order in Russian and Polish. This relation is expressed in terms of "marked" and "unmarked" word order rather than "normal" or "abnormal."

69 Mayer, Gerald Leon. "A Comparative Study of the Syntax of the Cardinal Numeral in the Slavic Languages." Pennsylvania, 1967. 332 pp.
D.A. 28.4 (1967), p. 1420-A. (67-12,778)

Aim is to study the peculiarities in the syntax of the cardinal numeral in each of the modern Slavic languages. Both diachronic and synchronic information is studied in order to arrive at a categorization of syntactic features and developments which are common to the Slavic languages.

70 Pae, Yang Seo. "English Loanwords in Korean." Texas, 1967. 199 pp.
D.A. 28.12 (1968), pp. 5038-39-A. (68-4326)

An attempt to provide "linguistic measurement" in order to separate loanwords from foreign words in Korean. The determining factor in the measurement of the degree of assimilation is the "familiarity category" defined by resorting to familiarity of several native speakers with the words in question. Chapter 3 presents a phonology of Korean, Japanese and English in terms of articulatory phonetics.

71 Rezazadeh, Gloria Iris. "A Comparative Analysis of the Structure of First Grade Children's Oral Speech in Spanish and English." Indiana, 1967. 186 pp.
D.A. 28.6 (1967), pp. 2231-32-A. (67-15,154)

Purpose is to compare the syntactic structure of first grade children's oral speech in Spanish and English as native speakers of these languages in order to improve the teaching of English as a second language to Puerto Rican children.

72 Rolfe, Oliver Willis. "A Quantitative Comparison of French and Spanish Verbal Systems." Stanford, 1967. 287 pp.
D.A. 28.7 (1968), p. 2669-A. (67-17,492)

Purpose is to determine certain statistical-structural properties of the French and Spanish verbal systems, and to compare the systems according

to these properties. The conclusions drawn from such analysis enabled the author to suggest certain theoretical and practical generalizations in the fields of general linguistics, applied linguistics, and stylistics.

73 Rulon, Curt Morris. "The Dialects in Huckleberry Finn." Iowa, 1967. 177 pp.
D.A. 28.6 (1967), p. 2232-A. (67-16-830)

Purpose is to ascertain the number of literary dialects represented in Huckleberry Finn and to identify the nature of alleged dialect differentiation. Some of the conclusions: 1) both regional and social dialect features are included in the speech of the characters in the novel, 2) the phonology of the Negro dialect is mainly Southern, and historically quite conservative compared to the Caucasian dialect.

74 Stark, Donald Stewart. "A Comparative Verb Morphology of Four Spanish Dialects." Cornell, 1967. 147 pp.
D.A. 28.6 (1967), p. 2234-A. (67-16,327)

A comparative study of the verb inflection systems of four contemporary Spanish dialects: Castilian, Asturian, Aragonese, and Judeo-Spanish. A verb grammar based on the generative model is constructed for each of the dialects. An attempt is made to determine the extent to which an examination of the rules of the respective grammars yields a greater amount of relevant information than a direct comparison of the primary data. Conclusion: validity of the recent proposal for rule rather than data comparison varies in inverse proportion to the grammatical (and therefore rule) complexity of the data involved.

75 Tiee, Henry Hung-ye. "An Approach for Teaching American English to Chinese Speakers Based on a Contrastive Syllabic and Prosodic Analysis." Texas, 1967. 234 pp.
D.A. 28.10 (1968), p. 4063-A. (68-4347)

A contrastive analysis of the syllable structure and prosodic features of English and Chinese with the aim of preparing drills for teaching English to Mandarin speakers.

76 Wilson, James Lawrence. "Some Phonological, Morphological, and Syntactic Correspondences between Standard Dutch and Afrikaans." Indiana, 1967. 244 pp.
D.A. 28.9 (1968), p. 3661-A. (68-2377)

The first monographic attempt at an analysis of the two "languages," Standard Dutch and Afrikaans. The description of the syntactic structures of the "languages" is in terms of phrase structure and transformational rules.

1968

77 Afendras, Evangelos Angelos. "The Balkans as a Linguistic Area: a Study in Phonological Convergence." Johns Hopkins, 1968. 224 pp.
D.A. 29.5 (1968), p. 1525-A. (68-16,394)

An attempt at quantitatively comparing phonological systems of Balkan languages in contact, through the use of Postovalov's notion of "distinctive feature valence." This notion answers the need for a feature distribution measure. The lengthy calculations necessary are performed on the digital computer.

78 Bhargava, Prem Sagar. "Linguistic Interferences from Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi and Internal Analogy in the Grammar of Indian English." Cornell, 1968. 223 pp.
D.A. 29.2 (1968), p. 583-A. (68-11,614)

This study attempts to correlate typical syntactic patterns of Indian English with structures of the native language of Indian users of English: Hindi, Urdu or Punjabi. Written texts (published in India) of educated Indians comprise the data for the study. Chapter 4 describes the linguistic interference from the three languages in the syntax of Indian English. Contrastive statements for only Hindi-English are provided since the three languages are considered "syntactically similar."

79 Bratton, Neil J.Q. "Structures and Messages in English and Arabic." Georgetown, 1968. 138 pp.
D.A. 29.8 (1969), p. 2694-A. (69-2693)

A suggestion that contrastive analyses be carried out on at least two levels: structure and messages. Concerning the former, transformational grammar can be used to compare whole "systems of sentence patterns" rather than just individual ones. Concerning the latter, i.e. "messages," Halliday's notions of theme and rheme, known and new, and information focus can be used to show how languages differ in marking and distributing these variables. For English-Arabic comparison, Fillmore's base rules are preferred to Chomsky's, since only the former and not the latter permits both languages to have the same first rule. In the final chapter, Arabic "equivalents" of thematic variation of English sentences are examined.

80 Cairns, Charles Edward. "Neutralization and Markedness in Phonological Rules." Columbia, 1968. 361 pp.
D.A. 30.2 (1969), p. 705-A. (69-9177)

A phonological theory including markedness and neutralization rules is proposed. The theory provides rules which may be justified by phonetically based arguments. It is claimed that comparison of data from English and Southern Paiute favors this theory over the Chomsky-Halle theory of generative phonology.

81 Fox, Robert Paul. "A Transformational Treatment of Indian English Syntax." Illinois, 1968. 132 pp.
D.A. 29.2 (1968), p. 586-A. (68-12,121)

This study attempts to show that non-beginning language learners "make errors only on the transformational level of grammar." Papers written in English by native speakers of Hindi provide the data. Chomsky's Aspects provides the system of analysis. A contrastive analysis of selected areas of Hindi-English syntax is used to show that though there are differences in the base component, the transformational component is the source of difficulty for the second-language learner.

82 Keefe, John Edwin. "A Comparison of the Use of Bahuvrīhi Compounds and Case-constructions in Selected Greek Authors." Johns Hopkins, 1968. 95 pp.
D.A. 29.5 (1968), p. 1526-A. (68-16,434)

A comparison of certain constructions in the work of seven Greek authors. Frequency of occurrence is shown in tables.

83 Killian, Vera Stanić. "The History of the Štokavian and Čakavian Declension Systems: a Study in the Contrastive Morphology of Serbo-Croatian." Columbia, 1968. 301 pp.
D.A. 30.2 (1969), p. 707-A. (69-12,981)

Aims to trace formal development of the nominal declension systems in the Štokavian and Čakavian dialects of Serbo-Croatian. Although this thesis is primarily historical, Chapter IV contains synchronic descriptions of the declension systems of the two dialects.

84 Noffke, Sister Mary Suzanne. "The Linguistic Analysis of Compared Stylistic Structures: Projections into a Linguistic Theory of Translation Illustrated in a Study of the Hebrew Text and Selected English Translation of Isaiah 1-5." Wisconsin, 1968. 395 pp.
D.A. 29.3 (1968), p. 890-A. (68-9111)

An attempt to compare style from language to language through the use of translation and the concepts of "norm" and "derivation." In this work, seven stylistic features are compared in two styles in Hebrew and English. Conclusion: the correspondence between the two styles can be made only through the relation of each to the natural style within its own language.

85 Qafisheh, Hamdi Ahmad. "English Pre-Nominal Modifiers and Corresponding Modern Standard Arabic Structures: a Contrastive Analysis." Michigan, 1968. 153 pp.
D.A. 29.8 (1969), pp. 2697-98-A. (69-2374)

A comparison, undertaken for pedagogical purposes, of English prenominal modifiers with structures which correspond in Modern Standard Arabic.

In this study there is no "strict adherence" to any linguistic model. The many differences found between the structures in the two languages exist within the framework of over-all similarity in their categorical structure, inventory of categories, and deep grammatical meanings.

86 Quackenbush, Edward Miller. "From Sonsorol to Truk: a Dialect Chain." Michigan, 1968. 226 pp.
D.A. 29.8 (1969), p. 2698-A. (69-2375).

A linguistic survey of the 60-odd small islands in the Caroline Islands. Basic vocabularies are compared. Results: the linguistic data shows that "these islands form an exceptionally well-defined example of a dialect chain."

87 Thomason, Sarah Grey. "Noun Suffixation in Serbo-Croatian Dialects." Yale, 1968. 258 pp.
D.A. 29.11 (1969), pp. 3994-95-A. (69-8446)

A contrast of noun suffixation in Serbo-Croatian dialects which presents evidence for the traditional grouping of this linguistic area into four major dialect groups: Štokavian, Torlak, Kajkavian, and Čakavian. Evidence is brought to bear from Turkish, Slovenian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian.

1969

88 Abdo, Daud Atiyeh. "Stress and Arabic Phonology." Illinois, 1969. 184 pp.
D.A. 30.7 (1970), p. 2987-A. (70-772)

Two rules are formulated to account for regularities in word stress in Classical Arabic and in the Palestinian, Egyptian, and Iraqui spoken dialects. In order to account correctly for stress and other related phonetic phenomena, these rules apply in conjunction with other rules, e.g. with a vowel deletion rule in Classical Arabic and with a methathesis rule in the spoken dialects. Ordering considerations are also important here. Rules for the dialects are very similar to each other, differing only slightly in their order or form. Other problems discussed include: vowel systems, vowel elision and epenthesis, suffixes, the root, the basic form of the verb, and emphasis.

89 Anshen, Frank Stephen. "Speech Variation among Negroes in a Small Southern Community." New York, 1969. 111 pp.
D.A. 30.6 (1969), pp. 2509-10-A. (69-21,234)

Attempts to determine the relationship between the speech of Negroes and Whites living in Hillsborough, North Carolina. The major finding in this regard is that Negroes seem to use a variety of English which is distinct from that used by Whites. Whites in Hillsborough use standard English forms more frequently than do Negroes.

90 Dempsey, Sister M. Espiritu. "The Measurement of Auditory Comprehension of French Based on a Contrastive Analysis of Standard French and American English." Georgetown, 1969. 195 pp. D.A. 30.10 (1970), p. 4435-A. (70-5931)

Follows Lado's view that the control of learning problems based on a contrastive analysis of the target and native languages is testing control of the language. Sixty learning problems in French structure were tested on American students. The intent to construct a valid and reliable test in auditory comprehension in basic French was verified by several statistical measures.

91 Feider, Helga. "A Comparative Syntactic Description of Spoken and Written English." Indiana, 1969. 286 pp. D.A. 30.4 (1969), pp. 1545-46-A. (69-14,703)

A spoken corpus was given to informants to be converted into a corresponding written corpus. Syntactic differences between spoken and written American English were then determined in terms of a two-part transformational grammar. One part accounted for the written corpus and for the portion of the spoken corpus judged "non-deviant." The other part provided "extension rules" to account for the deviant sentences of spoken English. The comparative grammar showed that most structures peculiar to spoken English can be described by transformational extensions (i.e. these differences are "superficial, not deep structure differences") and that spoken English has a greater variability in surface structure than written English.

92 Fryščák, Milan. "The Morphology of Slavic Numerals." Ohio State, 1969. 255 pp. D.A. 31.2 (1970), p. 742. (70-14,021)

Development of the inflectional morphology of numerals in Russian, Czech and Serbo-Croatian is emphasized, but discussion of the modern period includes a treatment of numeral stems that occur in word derivation. One result of the analysis is that numerals emerge as a class in the process of formation, the process being most advanced in Serbo-Croatian, moderately advanced in Russian, and in its initial stages in Czech.

93 Giveon, Talmy. "Studies in Chi Bemba and Bantu Grammar." U.C.L.A., 1969. 277 pp. D.A. 30.11 (1970), p. 4964-A. (70-9927)

Describes three major areas of the core grammar of Chi-Bemba: Nominals, Concordial Agreement, and the Verbal phrase. Implications of the analysis of concordial agreement for Universal Grammar (or Linguistic theory) are discussed. Concerning the verbal phrase, Fillmore's "Case Grammar" and Gruber's "Lexical Base" format are contrasted as to their ability to account for the facts of both Ichi-Bemba and English.

94 Hanzel, Louis Francis. "A Contrastive Analysis of the Principal Predication Types of English and Japanese." Georgetown, 1969. 220 pp.
D.A. 30.9 (1970), p. 3928. (70-4637)

In setting up the principal predication types of English and Japanese, primary reliance is given to "the deep structure as manifested through transformations and expansions of the sentence." The actual contrastive analysis is performed on the surface structure, and an attempt is made to predict the level of difficulty the native speaker of Japanese will encounter in the English predication types. Tests were constructed and sent to Japan. Four levels of difficulty are set up and it is claimed that contrastive analysis predictions are highly reliable.

95 Henrie, Samuel Nyal, Jr. "A Study of Verb Phrases Used by Five Year Old Nonstandard Negro English Speaking Children." U.C. (Berkeley), 1969. 140 pp.
D.A. 31.2 (1970), p. 743-A. (70-13,068)

To determine how kindergarten speakers of Nonstandard Negro English (NNE) form verb phrases, and to determine the semantics of these verb phrases, Standard English (SE) sentences were given to these children to retell. To separate effects resulting from age, middle class kindergarten children also performed the task. Results showed that the NNE speakers controlled all of the SE verb phrases given as input; about 1/3 of their output was non-standard. Percentage of occurrences of each nonstandard form was calculated against a base of the total occurrences of the form (standard and nonstandard). Also, a list of NNE forms is presented which were shown to differ in "semantic distribution" from their equivalents in SE.

96 Light, Richard L. "Syntactic Structures in a Corpus of Non-Standard English." Georgetown, 1969. 170 pp.
D.A. 30.10 (1970), pp. 4438-39-A. (70-5928)

Deals with the language used by 5 Black children in "interview-elicited conversations." Although this language is different from the language used with peers, it is assumed that it reveals what the children control in terms of language needed for success in school. Constructions in the speech of the children are compared with Standard English at the sentence, clause, phrase and word levels. No differences were discovered at the sentence level, but at the other levels, systematic differences were discovered, e.g. embedded questions, copula, invariant be, and ain't to mark past time.

97 McConochie, Jean Alice. "Simplicity and Complexity in Scientific Writing: a Computer Study of Engineering Textbooks." Columbia, 1969. 203 pp.
D.A. 31.1 (1970), pp. 378-79-A. (70-12,561)

Attempts to determine the relative frequency and sentencelevel use of syntactic structures in contemporary written American scientific English (civil and engineering text-books) and contemporary American literary prose (undergraduate anthologies). Computer results show that scientific writing uses a smaller subset of English sentencelevel patterns than does literary writing, and is thus a simpler version of English. The complexity of scientific writing is shown in a "nominal style" through the proportionally higher use of determiners and nominal and adjectival suffixes.

98 McKay, June Rumery. "A Partial Analysis of a Variety of Nonstandard Negro English." U.C. (Berkeley), 1969. 484 pp.
D.A. 30.11 (1970), p. 4967-A. (70-6163)

A generative transformational analysis of the speech of an elderly Negro lady (Mrs. C.), originally from Louisiana. This analysis follows Labov in treating those linguistic variables which reflect social class differences as inherent features of a speaker's repertoire. Based on a comparison of the rules in the partial grammars for Standard English and for Mrs. C.'s English, generalizations are presented about similarities and differences in various types of rules.

99 Natalicio, Eleanor D.S. "Formation of the Plural in English: a Study of Native Speakers of English and Native Speakers of Spanish." Texas (Austin), 1969. 194 pp.
D.A. 30.7 (1970), p. 2993-A. (69-21,865)

Compares the order of acquisition in the formation of plurals in English by native speakers of English and by native speakers of Spanish. A test was devised using nonsense syllables which permitted simulation of nouns in English. Among other results, it was found that no significant difference occurred in a comparison of the two groups in the first grade, but by the third grade the native speakers of Spanish performed significantly inferior, and by the 10th grade their performance was even more highly significantly inferior. In terms of order of acquisition, the performances of the two groups were consistent. No evidence was found for notions such as "interference" or "transfer" which would be suggested by a contrastive analysis of the two languages.

100 Orosz, Robert Andrew. "The Category of Definiteness and its Structural Corellates in English and Hungarian." Indiana, 1969, 234 pp.
D.A. 30.5 (1969), p. 2006-7-A. (69-17,770)

In this taxonomic study of definiteness in English and Hungarian, the syntactic relationships between the noun phrase and prior discourse are studied. One very important factor relating to definiteness, the "totality of reference" is used to set up three nonequivalent levels of definiteness in each language.

101 Pope, Mike. "The Syntax of the Speech of Urban (Tallahassee) Negro and White Fourth Graders." Florida State, 1969. 137 pp.
D.A. 31.3 (1970), p. 1252-A. (70-16,344)

Attempts to discover whether Tallahassee Negro and White 4th graders are members of the same population in their use of syntactic rules. In two separate studies, measures of "syntactic maturity" provided contradictory results: 1) in free speech, Negro and White fourth graders were found to be members of the same population; 2) in a "re-tell" study, the White 4th grade group significantly exceeded the Negro group on four measures. These two groups are not members of the same population with regard to total syntactic variations in phrase structure rules and on certain noun and verb morphological rule variations.

102 Pray, Bruce Raymond. "Agreement in Hindi-Urdu and its Phonological Implications." Michigan, 1969. 202 pp.
D.A. 30.5 (1969), pp. 2007-8-A. (69-18,085)

Seen as a first step toward a "more general grammar" of Indo-Aryan languages. Various Hindi dialects and related languages are used to support the view that transitivity is primarily a surface structure phenomenon which can be incorporated as two lexical features. A subset of rules of the phonological component are presented which specify three inflectional features. A direct link between semantic features and phonetic output is provided by one of the features.

103 Quinn, Robert Martin. "A Contrastive Study of Chinese and Vietnamese Lexotactics." Georgetown, 1969. 151 pp.
D.A. 30.4 (1969), p. 1549-A. (69-16,777)

The focus of this comparison between Mandarin Chinese and South Vietnamese is the structure of basic clause types and relationships among structures up to and including the rank of clause. The procedures employed follow stratificational theory (Lamb) and dependency theory (Hays) at the lexeme stratum, in terms of construction rules giving the dependency relations among the constituent lexemes. A conversion algorithm, suggested by the transfer grammar model (Harris), provides statements for changing Chinese lexemic strings to their Vietnamese translation equivalents.

104 Ridjanović, Midhat. "A Synchronic Study of Verbal Aspect in English and Serbo-Croatian." Michigan, 1969. 213 pp.
D.A. 30.9 (1970), pp. 3930-31-A. (70-4175)

Attempts to establish the categories needed to account for the aspectually conditioned co-occurrence restrictions in English and Serbo-Croatian. English aspect typically attaches to predications; the grammatical scope of aspect is limited not only to finite forms of the verb, but is also present in nominalized and adjectivalized structures. Two English deep structure

categories ("durative" and "punctual") are compared to three Serbo-Croatian categories ("stative," "oursive," and "totive"); the latter categories are formed as a result of the inadequacy of the traditional dichotomy, "perfective"/"imperfective." In spite of overt differences, the deep structure aspectual categories in English and Serbo-Croatian are essentially the same.

105 Rose, James Hosford. "Relational Variation and Limited Productivity in Some Indonesian and English Verbal Derivations." Michigan, 1969. 108 pp.
D.A. 31.5 (1970), p. 2371-A. (70-21,780)

An attempt to determine the limits of productivity and the range of variability in English and Indonesian derived verbs and the nouns they appear to be based on. A great many factors, including semantic ones, may be involved in determining these properties. The nature of productivity is examined and is associated with the property of creativity in language.

106 Saciuk, Bohdan. "Lexical Strata in Generative Phonology (with Illustrations from Ibero-Romance)." Illinois, 1969. 173 pp.
D.A. 31.2 (1970), p. 746-A. (70-13,467)

Data from Spanish, Portugese, and Catalan are used to illustrate a proposal for universal stratal marking conventions; this proposal is intended to account for the role that different strata of the lexicon play in generative phonology. Every language contains an unmarked stratum of lexical formations and the rules associated with it are the basic and natural rules for the language in question. These rules are discussed for the three languages involved after it is shown that five tense and five lax underlying vowels are needed to account for all the synchronic facts of the languages.

107 Smitherman, Geneva. "A Comparison of the Oral and Written Styles of a Group of Inner-City Black Students." Michigan, 1969. 157 pp.
D.A. 31.2 (1970), p. 747-A. (70-14,654)

The speech and writing of 14 black, inner city, junior high speakers of Black English were compared with respect to distribution of word classes, clause markers, and the rations verb-adjective and subordination. The speech and writing was also compared with respect to usage of verbs, nouns and pronouns, double negatives, adjectives, and adverbs. The result is that Black children do not write exactly as they speak. Their writing is more formal and precise and is characterized by a closer adherence to the standard grammar.

108 Streeter, Victor John. "Homogenity in a Sample of Technical English." Michigan, 1969. 140 pp.
D.A. 30.5 (1969), pp. 2008-9-A. (69-18,117)

Looks at the "homogeneity" (a statistical inference concept) of grammatical types within and between the writings of Bach and Pike. Measurements of homogeneity show that as regards consistency of usage, clause and sentence types occur generally with less consistency within and between the two writers than do word types. A discussion is presented of the weakness of statistical tests alone as a tool for measurement of homogeneity. A survey is presented of several recent quantitative studies of technical and non-technical English.

109 Vanek, Anthony Ladislav. "Subject-Verb Agreement." Illinois, 1969. 291 pp.
D.A. 31.2 (1970), p. 748-A. (70-13,525)

Deals with subject-verb agreement in inflected languages, with particular reference to Slavic languages. The distinction is made between deep and grammatical subject. The claim is made that only grammatical features and not semantic features play a role in agreement. The role of the grammatical formative in agreement is discussed and it is argued that a set of phonological matrix insertion rules is needed to supply these transformationally derived formatives with the appropriate phonological shape.

110 Whitman, Randal Loring. "Interference in Language Learning: a Theory of Contrastive Analysis with Examples from Japanese and English." Pennsylvania, 1969. 126 pp.
D.A. 30.7 (1970), p. 2995-A. (69-21,457)

Attacks the problem of the systematic location of sources of interference between two languages, and the development of a contrastive method that provides it. A mechanical system of contrast is derived which gives as output information such as the following: when a criterion in English is marked plus, and a criterion in Japanese is also marked plus, the English learner of Japanese may incorrectly translate English form X as Japanese form Y, even though Y may be perfectly well formed. The particular purpose of this contrastive system is for construction of language teaching materials in linguistic usage rather than linguistic structure.

111 Wolfram, Walter Andrew. "Linguistic Correlates of Social Stratification in the Speech of Detroit Negroes." Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1969. 324 pp.
D.A. 30.11 (1970), p. 4973-A. (70-7915)

This study is based on the speech of 48 Negroes, evenly distributed in four social classes. The speech of those Negroes most closely approximating

the standard English norm is compared with the speech of 12 upper-middle class white informants. A quantitative dimension is added to the examination of speech differences by studying the "linguistic variants." Both phonological and grammatical variables are discussed.

1970

112 Bachmann, James Kevin. "A Comparison of Nonstandard Grammatical Usage in Some Negro and White Working-Class Families in Alexandria, Virginia." Georgetown, 1970. 120 pp.
D.A. 31.5 (1970), p. 2364-A. (70-21,276)

Investigates differences in proportional usage of selected nonstandard grammatical features in Negro and White speech. Several tasks were presented to the informants and results, concerning the amount of nonstandard forms in speech, varied according to the tasks. Significant differences were found when Negro children were compared to White children as well as to Negro adults. The following hypothesis is supported by this study: Negro speech shows a higher usage of certain nonstandard grammatical features.

113 Calvano, William Joseph. "Synchronic Relationships: Five Romance Dialects." Cornell, 1970. 177 pp.
D.A. 30.12 (1970), p. 5429-A. (70-5761)

The approach which considers a single form as underlying all of the dialects compared and which predicts variations by different rules or rule-ordering is rejected on the grounds that it violates the concept of "grammar" as a formal description of the native speaker-hearer's competence. The special shapes of cognate items determined by predictability factors as well as rules for converting these shapes into another dialect are considered outside the grammar of all dialects concerned. A phonological sketch of five Romance dialects spoken in Italy (Catanese, Palermitano, Caposelese, Roccagorghese, and Caltellese) is presented; these dialects are compared and categorized on the basis of degree of predictability.

114 Fei, Peter Kuan-chen. "English and Chinese Consonants: a Contrastive Analysis." Michigan, 1970. 220 pp.
D.A. 31.5 (1970), p. 2366-A. (70-21,650)

A synchronic contrastive analysis of American English and Peking Mandarin Chinese consonantal phonemes, following procedures set up by Moulton. A contrastive analysis of the phonological structures of the two languages is presented. Actual errors made by Chinese informants are compared with predicted errors and, in most cases, it is possible to predict areas of facilitation and interference.

115 Ibrahim, Muhammad Musa Hasan. "A Study of Gender." Princenton, 1970. 244 pp.
D.A. 31.6 (1970), p. 2900-A. (79-23,621)

Purpose is to demonstrate that gender, as a grammatical category, did not arise because of any extra-linguistic factors. Evidence is brought to bear through historical linguistic analysis of Semitic and Indo-European languages. Further evidence comes from the assignment of genders to borrowed nouns in several gender-possessing languages, and in Bantu, noun classes are found to be similar to the gender phonomenon. The handling of gender within the framework of a generative grammar is briefly discussed. The section "Gender in Arabic" shows how the ideas presented in the study apply to a specific gender-possessing language.

116 Todaro, Martin Thomas. "A Contrastive Analysis of the Segmental Phonologies of American English and Cairo Arabic." Texas (Austin), 1970. 121 pp.
D.A. 31.4 (1970), pp. 1786-87-A. (70-18,298)

Attempts to locate structural differences between the segmental phonologies of American English and Cairo Arabic and to use these differences to predict pronunciation errors which speakers of the former will have in learning the latter. The predictions are grouped into four major classes (phonemic, phonetic, allophonic, and distributional), and are verified against a corpus of sentences read by informants in their first year of English language study.

ALPHABETICAL AUTHOR INDEX

Author's Name	Year of Thesis	Annotation Number
Abdo, Daud Atiyeh	1969	88
Afendras, Evangelos Angelos	1968	77
Aguas, Estrella Flora	1964	34
Alatis, James Efstathios	1966	51
Anantham, Sundur	1959	10
Anderson, Tommy Ray	1965	40
Anshen, Frank Stephen	1969	89
Aronson, Howard Isaac	1961	16
Asuncion, Nobleza Castro	1960	11
Atai, Parvin	1964	35
Bachmann, James Kevin	1970	112
Becker, Donald Allen	1967	59
Bendix, Edward Hermann	1965	41
Berberi, Dilaver	1964	36
Berger, Marshall Daniel	1951	3
Bhargava, Prem Sagar	1968	78
Brannen, Noah Samuel	1966	52
Bratton, Neil J.Q.	1968	79
Browning, Dorothy Ann	1967	60
Cadora, Frederic Joseph	1966	53
Cairns, Charles Edward	1968	80
Calvano, William Joseph	1970	113
Carlos, Lourdes Balderrama	1966	54
Chaiyaratana, Chalao	1961	17
Cohen, Pedro Isaac	1967	61
Colhoun, Edward Russell	1967	62
Cooke, Joseph Robinson	1965	42
Craven, T.K.	1948	1
Dempsey, Sister M. Espiritu	1969	90
Dingwall, William Orr	1964	37
Eastman, Carol Mary	1967	63
El-Ezabi, Yehia Ali	1967	64
Engler, Leo Francis	1962	21
Erickson, Jon Laroy	1965	43
Eyestone, Maynard Merlyn	1966	55
Fei, Peter Kuan-chen	1970	114
Feider, Helga	1969	91

Author's Name	Year of Thesis	Annotation Number
Fox, Robert Paul	1968	81
Fryščák, Milan	1969	92
Gasinski, Tadeusz Zdzislaw	1966	56
Giveon, Talmy	1969	93
Graves, Richard Layton	1967	65
Green, Eugene	1962	22
Greis, Naguib Amin Fahmy	1963	29
Guanco, Nelia Rivera	1963	30
Guerren, Louise	1955	5
Hanzel, Louis Francis	1969	94
Hashimoto, Mitsuo George	1967	66
Hennie, Samuel Nyal, Jr.	1969	95
Hội, Đao Thị	1965	44
Ibrahim, Muhammad Musa Hasan	1970	115
Jackson, Kenneth Leroy	1967	67
Junatado, Loreto Grajo	1961	18
Keefe, John Edwin	1968	82
Killian, Vera Stanić	1968	83
Kimizuka, Sumako	1962	23
Kleinjans, Everett	1958	8
Kohmoto, Sutesaburo	1960	12
Koolemans-Beijnen, Gijsbertus J.W.	1967	68
Kreidler, Charles William	1958	9
Kruatrachue, Foongfuang	1960	13
Light, Richard L.	1969	96
McConochie, Jean Alice	1969	97
McIntosh, Lois	1953	4
McKay, June Rumery	1969	98
Mayer, Gerald Leon	1967	69
Mendoza Castelo, Lutgarda	1962	24
Meyerstein, Rud S.	1955	6
Nasr, Raja Tewfik	1955	7
Natalicio, Eleanor D.S.	1969	99
Nemser, William Joseph	1961	19
Ney, James Walter	1963	31
Noffke, Sister Mary Suzanne	1968	84

Author's Name	Year of Thesis	Annotation Number
Orosz, Robert Andrew	1969	100
Otanes, Fe Torres	1966	57
Pae, Yang Seo	1967	70
Pascasio, Emy Mariano	1960	14
Pope, Mike	1969	101
Pray, Bruce Raymond	1969	102
Qafisheh, Hamdi Ahmad	1968	85
Quackenbush, Edward Miller	1968	86
Quinn, Robert Martin	1969	103
Rezazadeh, Gloria Iris	1967	71
Ridjanović, Midhat	1969	104
Rivera de Velázquez, Mary D.	1964	38
Rolfe, Oliver Willis	1967	72
Rose, James Hosford	1969	105
Rubenstein, Herbert	1949	2
Rudaravanija, Panninee	1965	45
Ruiz, Macario Bueno	1963	32
Rulon, Curt Morris	1967	73
Saciuk, Bohdan	1969	106
Sáez, Mercedes de los Angeles	1962	25
Satterthwait, Arnold Chase	1962	26
Schachter, Paul	1960	15
Sebuktekin, Hikmet Ibrahim	1964	39
Sibayan, Bonifacio Padilla	1961	20
Simpson, Harold Burton	1965	46
Siracusa, Joseph	1962	27
Smitherman, Geneva	1969	107
Sprenger, Arnold, S.V.D.	1965	47
Stark, Donald Stewart	1967	74
Streeter, Victor John	1969	108
Theivananthampillai, K.	1965	48
Thomason, Sarah Grey	1968	87
Tiee, Henry Hung-ye	1967	75
Todaro, Martin Thomas	1970	116
Topping, Donald Medley	1963	33
Vanek, Anthony Ladislav	1969	109
Verma, Manindra Kishore	1966	58

Author's Name	Year of Thesis	Annotation Number
Wakeham, Mabel Irene	1965	49
Whitman, Randal Loring	1969	110
Wilson, James Lawrence	1967	76
Wolfram, Walter Andrew	1969	111
Yarmohammadi, Lotfollah	1965	50

INDEX OF LANGUAGES, LANGUAGE FAMILIES, AND DIALECTS

Number following author's name refers to annotation number. Starred entries indicate dialect studies.

AFRIKAANS
Wilson, 76

ALBANIAN
Berberi, 36

ARABIC
*Abdo, 88
Bratton, 79
*Cadora, 53
El-Ezabi, 64
Erickson, 43
Greis, 29
Ibrahim, 115
Nasr, 7
Qafisheh, 85
Satterthwait, 26
Todaro, 116

BALKAN LANGUAGES (general)
Afendras, 77

BANTU LANGUAGES (general)
Giveon, 93
Ibrahim, 115

BULGARIAN
Aronson, 16

BURMESE
Cooke, 42

CAROLINE ISLANDS
*Quackenbush, 86

CEBUANO/VISAYAN
Anderson, 40
Flores, 28

CHAMORRO
Topping, 33

CHIBEMBA
Giveon, 93

CHINESE
Fei, 114
McIntosh, 4
Quinn, 103
Sprenger, 47
Tiee, 75

CZECH
Fryščák, 92
Rubenstein, 2

DUTCH
Wilson, 76

ENGLISH
Aguas, 34
Alatis, 51
Anantham, 10
Anderson, 40
*Anshen, 89
Asuncion, 11
Atai, 35
*Bachmann, 112
Bendix, 41
Berger, 3
Bhargava, 78
Bratton, 79
Browning, 60
Cairns, 80
Carlos, 54
Chaiyaratana, 17
Cohen, 61
Dempsey, 90
El-Ezabi, 64
Engler, 21
Erickson, 43
Eyestone, 55
Fei, 114
Feider, 91
Flores, 28
Fox, 81
Giveon, 93
*Graves, 65
Green, 22
Greis, 29
Guanco, 30
Gurren, 5
Hanzel, 94
Hashimoto, 66
*Henrie, 95
Hoi, 44
Jackson, 67
Juntado, 18
Kimizuka, 23

ENGLISH (cont.)
Kleinjans, 8
Kohmoto, 12
Kreidler, 9
Kruatrachue, 13
*Light, 96
McConochie, 97
McIntosh, 4
*McKay, 98
Mendoza Castelo, 24
Meyerstein, 6
Nasr, 7
Natalicio, 99
Nemser, 19
Ney, 31
Noffke, 84
Orosz, 100
Otanes, 57
Pae, 70
Pascasio, 14
*Pope, 101
Qafisheh, 85
Rezazadeh, 71
Ridjanović, 104
Rivera de Velázquez, 38
Rose, 105
Rudaravanija, 45
Ruiz, 32
*Rulon, 73
Sáez, 25
Satterthwait, 26
Schachter, 15
Sebuktekin, 39
Sibayan, 20
Simpson, 46
*Smitherman, 107
Streeter, 108
Theivananthampillai, 48
Tiee, 75
Todaro, 116
Topping, 33
Verma, 58
Wakeham, 49
Whitman, 110
*Wolfram, 111
Yarmohammadi, 50

FILIPINO VERNACULARS (general)
Wakeham, 49

FRENCH
Craven, 1
Dempsey, 90
McIntosh, 4
Meyerstein, 6
Rolfe, 72

GERMAN
*Becker, 59
Engler, 21
McIntosh, 4
Meyerstein, 6
Sprenger, 47

GREEK
Alatis, 51
Keefe, 82

HEBREW
Noffke, 84

HILIGAYNON
Juntado, 18
Ruiz, 32

HINDI/URDU
Bendix, 41
Bhargava, 78
Browning, 60
Fox, 81
*Pray, 102
Verma, 58

HUNGARIAN
Nemser, 19
Orosz, 100

ILOCANO
Asuncion, 11
Sibayan, 20

INDONESIAN
Rose, 105

ITALIAN
Siracusa, 27

JAPANESE
Bendix, 41
*Brannen, 52
Hanzel, 94
Hashimoto, 66
Jackson, 67
Kimizuka, 23
Kleinjans, 8
Kohomoto, 12
Ney, 31
Pae, 70
Whitman, 110

KOREAN
Pae, 70

PANGASINAN
Schachter, 15

PERSIAN
Atai, 35
Yarmohammadi, 50

POLISH
Gasinski, 56
Koolemans-Beijnen, 68

PORTUGUESE
Saciuk, 106

PUNJABI
Bhargava, 78

ROMANCE LANGUAGES (general)
*Calvano, 113

RUSSIAN
Aronson, 16
Berger, 3
Fryščák, 92
Gasinski, 56
Koolemans-Beijnen, 68
Rubenstein, 2

SERBO-CROATIAN
Fryščák, 92
*Killian, 83
Ridjanović, 104
Rubenstein, 2
*Thomason, 87

SLAVIC LANGUAGES (general)
Fryščák, 92
Mayer, 69
Vanek, 109

SOUTHERN PAIUTE
Cairns, 80

SPANISH
Cohen, 61
*Colhoun, 62
Craven, 1
Gurren, 5
Kreidler, 9
Natalicio, 99
Rezazadeh, 71
Rivera de Velázquez, 38
Rolfe, 72
*Saciuk, 106
Sáez, 25
Siracusa, 27
*Stark, 74

SWAHILI
*Eastman, 63

TAGALOG
Aguas, 34
Carlos, 54
Guanco, 30
Mendoza Castelo, 24
Otanes, 57
Pascasio, 14

TAMIL
Theivananthampillai, 48

TELUGU
Anantham, 10

THAI
Chaiyaratana, 17
Cooke, 42
Kruatrachue, 13
Rudaravanija, 45

TURKISH
Berberi, 36
Sebuktekin, 39

VIETNAMESE
Cooke, 42
Hồi, 44
Quinn, 103

YIDDISH
Green, 22

Željko Bujas (University of Zagreb)

A CONTRASTIVE-ANALYSIS EVALUATION OF CONVERSION IN ENGLISH AND SERBO-CROATIAN

0.1. This paper will treat conversion (also termed: functional shift, functional change, derivation by a zero-morpheme, zero-derivation) in English and Serbo-Croatian, defining it as the conscious use of a lexical item in a function beyond its original or "proper" part-of-speech limits.

0.2. This linguistic phenomenon is very common in English, resulting in a considerable expansion of the lexical inventory, while only exceptionally encountered in Serbo-Croatian. The principal reason for this discrepancy is the historical loss of endings in English which gave rise to derivation by a zero-morpheme on a wide scale, resulting in a still active word-formation habit in that language[1].

0.3. We have included English attributive nouns[2] in this evaluation for strong pragmatic reasons (respecting the linguistic feeling of Serbo-Croat speakers who early and consistently perceive these nouns as "changing into adjectives").

0.4. Complete Conversion will be used here to mean the total transfer of items under study to another part-of-speech area, in which process all the forms and functions of the new family are adopted, while all former characteristics and properties are dropped. So swim, having converted to noun, can have a plural form (three swims a day) or be preceded by modifiers

(early swims) and determiners (her swim, this swim), function as subject (early swims are good for you), etc.

0.5. Partial Conversion is defined as the process in which the converted noun takes on only some of the characteristics of the other part of speech, retaining certain features of its original part-of-speech affiliation. Thus, budget in budget prices, although functioning as an adjective (in its use as an attributive), cannot be put through comparison (*more/*most budget prices).

1. CONVERSION IN ENGLISH

A. On Word Level

a) Complete Conversion

1.1. Verbs → Nouns (Deverbal Substantives)

(1) Let's go for a swim.
(1SC) Idemo na kupanje. (Idemo se kupati.)

(2) He will be giving a talk on Cyprus.
(2SC) Održat će predavanje o Cipru.

(3) He is always on the go.
(3SC) Uvijek je u pokretu.

(4) A few don'ts.
(4SC) Nekoliko upozorenja.

(5) A must for every fashionable woman.
(5SC) Nešto bez čega ne može biti nijedna elegantna žena.

1.1.1. Compound Verbs → Nouns

(6) We had two breakdowns caused by the bad roads.

(6SC) Imali smo dva kvara zbog loših puteva.

(7) Three robbers planned their getaway well.

(7SC) Tri su provalnika dobro pripremila bijeg.

(8) The splashdown is expected at 2:30.

(8SC) Spuštanje kapsule na morsku površinu očekuje se u 2:30.

1.2. Nouns → Verbs (Denominal Verbs, Desubstantival Verbs)

(9) We elbowed our way through the crowd.

(9SC) Progurali smo se (laktovima) kroz gomilu.

(10) It is a gap difficult to bridge.

(10SC) To je jaz koji se teško može premostiti (To je teško premostiv jaz).

(11) We shouldered our packs.

(11SC) Uprtili smo ranče.

1.3. Adjectives → Verbs (Deadjectival Verbs)

(12) I'll bloody your nose.

(12SC) Razbit ću ti nos.

(13) The flash blinded us.

(13SC) Bljesak nas je zaslijepio.

(14) Dogs always dirty floors.

(14SC) Psi uvijek zaprljaju pod.

1.4. Adjectives → Nouns (Deadjectival Nouns)

(15) You're such a silly.

(15SC) Ludo jedna.

(16) Streets were full of drunks.

(16SC) Ulice su bile pune pijanaca.

(17) Promotion stills have arrived.

(17SC) Stigli su reklamni fotosi.

(18) Browns and greens dominate.

(18SC) Prevladavaju smeđi i zeleni tonovi.

(19) Two Italians were killed.

(19SC) Dva su Talijana poginula.

1.5. Adverbs → Verbs (Deadverbial Verbs)

(20) They upped the charges for their services.

(20SC) Povisili su cijene svojih usluga.

1.6. Adverbs → Nouns (Deadverbial Nouns)

(21) the ups and downs of life

(21SC) životne peripetije

1.7. Interjections → Verbs

(22) The squadron hurrahed and attacked.

(22SC) Eskadron uzviknu "hura!" i krenu u napad.

1.8. Conjunctions → Nouns

(23) There are too many ifs in your plan.

(23SC) U vašem planu ima previše neizvjesnosti/pretpostavki.

1.9. Conjunctions → Verbs

(24) But me no buts!

(24SC) Bez ikakvih "ali"! (Neću nikakvih "ali"!)

b. Partial Conversion

1.10. Adjectives → Nouns

1.10.1. the + Adj = Noun (in pl.≠ sg.)

(25) The sick and the poor were cared for.

(25SC) Vodila se briga o bolesnima/bolesnicima i siromašnima/siromašima.

(26) The curious thronged around the scene of the accident.

(26SC) Gomila znatiželjnika okupila se oko mjesta nesreće.

(27) The English and the Welsh have much of their history in common.

(27SC) Englezi i Velšani imaju dobrim dijelom zajedničku povijest.

(28) The deceased was a gentle man.

(28SC) Pokojni(k) je bio miran i dobar čovjek.

1.10.2. ∅ + Adj = Sg. Noun

(29) Russian is the largest Slavic language.

(29SC) Ruski je najveći slavenski jezik.

1.10.3. the + Adj (of abstract quality) = Sg. Noun

(30) They love the bizarre.

(30SC) Oni vole (sve što je) bizarno.

1.11. Nouns → Adjectives

(31) New York skyscrapers are a breath-taking sight.

(31SC) Njujorški neboderi zapanjuju čovjeka.

(32) A well-preserved stone ax was found at the site.

(32SC) Tu je nadjena jedna dobro uščuvana kamena sjekira.

(33) The cups are kept on the top shelf.

(33SC) Pokali se čuvaju na gornjoj/najvišoj polici.

1.12. Superlative Adv → Nouns

(34) It is an imitation at best.

(34SC) To je u najboljem slučaju imitacija.

1.13. Adverbs → Adjectives

(35) The then secretary was summoned to testify.

(35SC) Tadašnja tajnica pozvana je na svjedočenje.

(36) The above table is incomplete.

(36SC) Gornja tabela je nepotpuna.

B. ON GROUP, CLAUSE, AND SENTENCE LEVEL

1.14. Part of the conversion processes so far listed normally include rank shifting in addition to the transfer from one part-of-speech category to another. Thus, for instance, the conversion of Noun to Adjective is at the same time a shift from Primary to Secondary.

This downward shift is predominant in the cases of conversion: Word Group → Noun/Adjective and Clause/Sentence → Noun/Adjective/Verb.

1.15. Word Group → Noun

(37) We need an expert here, not a jack-of-all-trades.

(37SC) Nama je tu potreban stručnjak a ne neki majstor za sve.

1.16. Word Group → Adjective

(38) Him and his good-for-nothing friends!

(38SC) On i njegovi prijatelji propalice!

1.17. Clause/Sentence → Noun

(39) Yesterday we saw You know who.

(39SC) Jučer smo vidjeli (onoga —) znaš već koga.

1.18. Clause/Sentence → Adjective

(40) Easy-to-consult etymologies are a great asset.

(40SC) Pregledne etimologije su velika prednost.

(41) He's one of those I-told-you-so types.

(41SC) On je jedan od onih tipova koji vole isticati da su bili u pravu.

1.19. Clause/Sentence → Verb

(42) There I was 'yes-maming' all day long.

(42SC) I tako sam tamo cijeli božji dan govorio "da, gospodjo".

1.20. Being at the same time compounds, some types of these conversions have also been discussed in this author's report on composition, already presented to this Project (cf. Reports 3, 1-12).

2. CONVERSION IN SERBO-CROAT

2.1. Failure to recognize conversion as a major linguistic phenomenon in the traditional description of Serbo-Croat is best illustrated by the fact that the few examples recorded are found scattered in isolated paragraphs or observations within the major divisions traditionally termed "morfologija vrsta riječi" and "sintaksa vrsta riječi".

2.2. Conversion in Serbo-Croat is always partial, in the sense that the converted item retains its full original flexion, or (with no-flexion items) acquires none. The retention of original paradigms is facilitated by the largely parallel sets of suffixes in the "nominal" parts of speech. The non-acquisition of flexion in such conversions as adverb → noun, conjunction → noun, etc. because of the suspension of such items from their normal syntactic affiliation is explained in more detail in 2.8.

2.3. Nouns → Adjectives

2.3.1. Prenominally

(43) Čelik-karakteri danas su rijetki.
(43E) Cast-iron characters are rare nowadays.

(44) Izgubio je jedinca-sina u ratu.
(44E) He lost his only son in the war.

2.3.1.1. N.B. 1) Prenominal proper names (e.g. kina vino, minas kava, britanija metal, Lederer pivo) have been excluded, because such attributives are still felt as only partially adopted foreign appellations.

2) N + N items — like duhankesa, nalivpero, ložulje, etc. — are distinctly felt as compounds, and have been treated in my report on Composition (Reports 3, p. 1, 2.11.)

2.3.2. Postnominally

(45) Zagreb će biti grad domaćin idućem kongresu.
(45E) Zagreb will be the host town of the next congress.

(46) Dva Nizozemca-brodolomca primjećena su na splavi.
(46E) The two shipwrecked Dutchmen have been sighted on a raft.

(47) Prinesoše žrtve paljenice.

(47E) Burnt offerings were made.

2.4. Adjectives —► Nouns

2.4.1. (48) Sit gladnome ne vjeruje.

(48E) People with full stomachs are distrustful of the hungry.

(49) Diž' se, stari!

(49E) Get up, old man!

2.4.2. Collective Meaning

(50) I muško i žensko u Peruu žvače koku.

(50E) Both men and women (both sexes) chew coca in Peru

2.4.3. Elliptical Colloquialisms

(51) Idemo splitskim brzim.

(51E) We're taking the fast train for Split.

2.4.3.1. N.B. The last type (elliptical colloquialisms) is rather common in Serbo-Croat (but very rare in English):

socijalno (osiguranje)	National Health Insurance
dramsko (kazalište)	Drama Theater
personalni (referent)	personal manager
predvojnička (obuka)	pre-military training

As cen be seen, they assume the gender of the omitted noun.

2.4.4. Abstract Notions

(52) Poklonik lijepoga postao je potkraj života.

(52E) He became an admirer of the beautiful late in life.

(53) Mene privlači fantastično i bizarno.

(53E) I am attracted by the fantastic and the bizarre.

(54) Traženje apsolutnog spada u područje filozofije.

(54E) The quest for the absolute is part of philosophy.

2.5. Pronouns

Since pronouns can normally replace nouns in the sentence (i.e. they then function syntactically as nouns), this seems to exhaust their conversion potential.

2.5.1. The linguistic feeling of Serbo-Croat speakers, however, sets apart the elliptical use of possessive pronouns perceived as especially close to nouns (cf. 2.4.3.1.)

(55) Moja je ljubomorna.

(55E) My wife is jealous.

(56) Moji su protiv.

(56E) My folks are against it.

(57) Naši dolaze!

(57E) Our soldiers/troops are coming!

2.6. Verbs

Verbal items in Serbo-Croat very rarely convert to anything else, except for a few isolated examples of expressive phrases:

(58) Došlo je do stani-pani.

(58E) Matters came to a violent head.

2.7. Adverbs → Nouns

(59) Svako naše jučer bilo je sadržajnije.

(59E) All our yesterdays were more meaningful.

(60) Svako lani bolje.

(60E) Every last year was better.

(61) Mnogo je relativan pojam.

(61E) Much is a relative notion.

2.8. Items in "syntactic suspension"

The last example (61) is, obviously, of a different quality, presenting much as, what might be termed, the "item under discussion", and almost requiring that it be set apart by italics or quotes. Indeed, this convention of italics/quotes is a peculiar signal that the item delimited by them is to be considered as momentarily suspended from its normal part-of-speech affiliation (and the syntactic links normally shared). The term "quotation noun" has been used by grammarians in obvious reference to the capacity of these items to function as subjects or objects. What we have here, thus, is for all practical purposes a type of conversion in the direction of noun.

2.8.1 This quasi-nominal conversion through a device of graphic differentation is possible with any part of speech:

(62) "Hoću" nije dovoljno jamstvo. (verb)

(62E) "I will" is not a sufficient guarantee.

(63) "Nepromišljen" je slaba riječ. (adjective)

(63E) "Ill-advised" is putting it mildly.

(64) Svako tvoje "ali" je suvišno. (conjunction)

(64E) All your buts are superfluous.

2.0.2. However, the break in normal syntactic progression of the statement (graphic delimiters or, in utterances, extra stress and changed intonation) qualify this type of conversion as marked, as reserved for special purposes.

3. TEACHING IMPLICATIONS

3.1. The fact that conversion is very common in English, while only exceptionally encountered in Serbo-Croatian (cf. 0.2.), puts this linguistic item under very definite restrictions in terms of its contrastive teaching potential.

3.2. One is faced here with the necessity of teaching the Serbo-Croat learner a vocabulary-expansion device important in English, for which this learner can draw on a very limited parallel linguistic habit in his native language.

3.3. In one's efforts to do so one has to anticipate the following teaching aims (probably in this suggested order):

1. Recognition of conversion in English.
2. Awareness of its usefulness in vocabulary expansion and stimulation of its use.
3. Awareness of its limitations.)
4. Introduction of contrastively profitable patterns from Serbo-Croat and their reinforcement.

3.4. Lesson texts and types of exercises will, naturally, have to be designed separately for each of these teaching aims/stages.

3.4.1. For aim 1, for instance, one may have to compile texts abundantly illustrative of conversion in English, accompanied by exercises designed to make pupils recognize the phenomenon of conversion (e.g. questions relating to instances of conversion in the lesson).

3.4.2. The usefulness of conversion as a device to expand the learner's English vocabulary (aim 2) may best be grasped through substitution exercises of the type "Replace underlined words with a single word" (e.g. "We used our elbows to push our way through the crowd" to be simplified as "We elbowed our way through the crowd").

3.4.2.1. Or by sentence-rewording exercises, like "The capsule is expected to splash down at 5:30", where the learner would be required to convert the underlined words and produce: "The capsule splash-down is expected at 5:30".

3.4.3. The third teaching aim has been marked by parentheses as optional, since an awareness of restrictions will probably have developed parallel with the expanding knowledge of conversion in English.

It is possible to visualize exercises of the following type:

"You are so dear" —— "You are such a dear"
"You are so silly" —— "You are such a silly"
but: "You are so clever" —— *"You are such a clever"
correct: "You are such a clever boy/man" etc.

3.4.4. The established contrastive conversion patterns between English and Serbo-Croat (aim 4) should be introduced as the last stage. (Some of them —— like the + Adj in English equalling Serbo-Croat plural nouns, cf. 1.10.1. —— will have already been introduced as paragraphs in the basic grammar of English.) Their order does not matter very much since most of them clearly belong to the more advanced stages of learning English. They might, for the sake of convenience, be attached to the sections of grammar dealing with the particular part of speech. Thus, patterns 2.4.4. and 2.5.1. may conveniently be presented with adjectives and pronouns respectively.

3.4.4.1. As to the type of exercises that should introduce and reinforce such patterns, translation of sentences or specially designed texts from Serbo-Croat to English is, in my view, the most efficient method.

NOTES

1. Hans Marchand (in The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. C.H.Beck, Munich, 1969, p. 367) says: "... there is an ever growing tendency to derive verbs from substantives without derivative morphemes". His approach, however, is diachronic, making no distinction between what may be termed historical conversion and what Zandvoort, in A Handbook of English Grammar (§772), qualifies as "the deliberate transfer of a word from one part of speech to another". Though Zandvoort takes no explicit stand on synchrony vs. diachrony, his stress on the importance of the quantitative aspect (i.e. size of individual part-of-speech proportions within the "grammatical homograph") speaks, no doubt, in favour of a basically synchronic approach. (Cf. also: Ž. Bujas, Homografski tipovi u engleskom (Homograph Types in English), Filološki pregled, Beograd 1966, I-IV, 33-43.)

2. This class, termed "substantives as preadjuncts" and "transposed substantives" by H. Marchand (op. cit., pp. 360, 361), is excluded by him, because this use "represents a regular syntactic pattern which has nothing to do with word-formation and derivation". On the other hand, the same author excludes such a clear case of formal transposition as nouns of the type hopeful (pl. hopefuls), since "the majority [of such nouns] are simply elliptic expressions in which the sb is absent but can always be supplied" (op. cit., p. 361).

Vladimir Ivir (University of Zagreb)

ATTRIBUTIVE PATTERNS FOR ENGLISH ADJECTIVES AND THEIR CONTRASTIVE CORRESPONDENTS IN SERBO-CROATIAN[1]

0. Introductory

0.1. Traditional grammar recognizes attributive use as a basic feature of adjectives. This is seen in the names like adjective, pridjev, имя прилагательное, as well as in the definitions which speak of adjectives as that part of speech which is "added to a noun or pronoun"[2]. Structuralists define adjectives as items capable, among other things, of occupying both the attributive ("between the and the Class 1 word") and the predicative ("after the Class 2 word") slot in the test frame[3]. Generativists, however, from the Port Royal School to Chomsky, see adjectives as primarily predicative elements and regard their attributive uses as derived from predicative kernels in simple sentences[4] or relative clauses[5].

0.2. The following examples of attributive adjectives will illustrate the range of syntactic phenomena involved in modification and supply a starting point for our contrastive analysis:

A. Prenominal modification

(1) She lives in a small room.

(2) She is a beautiful dancer.

(3) She is an excellent teacher.

(4 Russian students will meet this afternoon.

(5) Medical students must learn to handle medical instruments.

(6) This is a very slow-moving vehicle.

(7) She has a very winning smile.

(8) All peace-loving nations will support this move.

(9) The house-moving operation was completed in two days.

(10) What you say is sheer nonsense.

B. Postnominal modification

(11) Did you notice anything odd?

(12) I bought a book yellow with age.

(13) These are trends peculiar to this country.

(14) Can we say that we have the best government imaginable?

(15) He was brought before the court-martial, which sentenced him to a prison term of 15 years.

0.3. Closely connected with the syntactic nature of attributive adjectives and their semantic interpretation is the question of their prenominal ordering when several of them modify the same noun:

(16) They have a beautiful old white house.

(17) What she feels for him is nothing but a deep personal animosity.

(18) A new steel bridge now spans the river.

(19) Surprisingly enough, steel dental equipment is our major export item.

(20) Last night I attended an interesting religious meeting at which I met a number of deeply religious young people.

0.4. Even a superficial glance at the sentences given here will convince one that different syntactic processes are at work in attributive modification and that the resulting semantic relationships also differ. The view that all these adjectives come from the predicative field cannot be upheld. Serbo-Croatian -- at least in some cases -- reflects the difference directly in its surface form.

1. Derived attributive: attributive from predicative adjectives

1.1. Even though it is too much to claim that all attributive adjectives are derived transformationally from the predicative (relative) field, it is nevertheless true that many adjectives are so derived:

(21) She lives in a room. / The room is small. ⟶ She lives in a room that is small. ⟶ She lives in a room small. ⟶ She lives in a small room.

The same transformation operates in Serbo-Croatian, with the same result:

(21SC) Ona živi u sobi. / Soba je mala. ⟶ Ona živi u sobi koja je mala. ⟶ Ona živi u sobi maloj. ⟶ Ona živi u maloj sobi.

The only difference between the two languages is the agreement in case between the noun and its adjective in Serbo-Croatian and the lack of this agreement in English. However, this fact will have no effect on Serbo-Croatian learners of English, who easily learn to disregard agreement phenomena when using English adjectives.

1.2. Semantically speaking, attributive adjectives thus obtained are true descriptive adjectives, also called "common adjectives"[6], which serve as ordinary epithets and denote quality. Their function is that of characterization[7], and it is for this reason that only non-temporary predicative adjectives move to the attributive position, to denote a quality of a more permanent kind[8]. Temporary predications fail to transform into attributive structures:

(22) Some children are ready, and others are not yet ready.
*The ready children may already go and play in the garden.

(22SC) Neka su djeca gotova (spremna), a druga nisu. *Gotova (spremna) djeca mogu se već ići igrati u vrt.

One and the same adjective can appear in both temporary and non-temporary predications, and its ability to move to the attributive position will depend on the nature of the noun to be modified[9]: a nearby building, a nearby group vs. *a nearby man, *a nearby bus. Again, the same restriction holds in Serbo-Croatian: obližnja zgrada, obližnja skupina vs. *obližnji čovjek, *obližnji autobus. It is rather indicative that when čovjek is replaced by a noun designating a human that is by definition less likely to move (whose "obližnjost" is therefore of a more permanent kind), the attributive collocation becomes acceptable: obližnji gledalac.

In English, the temporary adjective does not go into attributive position when a homonymous modifier is possible with the same noun: *the present students (vs. the absent students). Since there is no homonymy in Serbo-Croatian in this case, prisutni studenti is as natural as odsutni studenti and errors and misunderstandings can be predicted in the learner's speech: his present students will be interpreted as sadašnji studenti (as against past students), while he himself may translate present students, wrongly as prisutni (nazočni) studenti. An interesting case of conflation in English is the meaning of present in present company: this collocation is admitted because the two senses (i.e., the antonyms of both absent and past) are not mutually exclusive here.

2. Derived attributive: adverb transformation

2.1. The well-known ambiguity of sentence (2) above already points to the fact that there are attributive adjectives which do not originate in be-predications:

(23) She is a dancer. / She is beautiful. ⟶ She is a dancer who is beautiful. ⟶ She is a dancer beautiful. ⟶ She is a beautiful dancer. (Cf. She is a blonde, beautiful dancer.) (Cf. also: She dances and she is beautiful.)

(24) She dances beautifully. ⟶ She is a dancer beautiful. ⟶ She is a beautiful dancer. (Cf. She is a fast and beautiful dancer. vs. *She is a fast and blonde dancer.) (Cf. also: She dances fast and beautifully.)

Serbo-Croatian creates no ambiguity in this particular instance:

(2SC) Ona je lijepa plesačica. ⟵ {Ona je plesačica. (Cf. Ona je mlada i lijepa plesačica.) / Ona je lijepa.}

⟵ *Ona pleše lijepo. (Cf. *Ona je dobra i lijepa plesačica.)

Other adjectives are used when the interpretation of sentence (2) is like that of (24):

(2aSC) Ona je sjajna (izvrsna, odlična) plesačica.

While these adjectives can, semantically, only apply to the action of dancing, not to the person involved, the adjective krasan is capable of producing both types of modification and the following sentence is therefore ambiguous:

(2bSC) Ona je krasna plesačica.

2.2. This last example shows that the relation of modification of this "adverbial" type holds, not between the adjective and the noun, but between the action which underlies the agentive noun and the quality of that action specified in the adjective. In combination with agentive nouns, some adjectives (e.g. sjajan) can only establish this type of modification, while others (e.g. krasan) have double modificational valency. This phenomenon exists in both English and Serbo-Croatian and is thus contrastively not very significant -- particularly in view of the fact that adjective sub-classification by this criterion yields very similar results in the two languages.

It can only be added here that "adverbial" modification is also possible when no clear verb underlies the noun, and even when there is no adverb on which to base the adjective: fine student (*study finely), excellent poet (*poetize excellently), good journalist (*journalize well), etc. Plausible paraphrases for these forms would be phrases with as: fine as a student, excellent as a poet, good as a journalist, which again indicate that the adjective is not to be regarded as an epithet to the noun but rather as modifying the action to which the noun refers.

3. Derived attributive: relative-clause verb transformation

3.1. Our sentences (6), (7) and (8) illustrate -ing attributives derived from yet another source -- from the verb of the relative clause. Strictly speaking, only examples like (7) are true adjectives: they can be used predicatively and attributively, they accept very as an intensifier, they compare, and they

coordinate with regular descriptive adjectives[10]. Their origin lies in a group of verbs which take an indefinite human object, e.g. win one (people, everybody); thus:

(25) She has a smile. / Her smile wins one. ⟶ She has a smile that wins one. ⟶ She has a smile that wins. ⟶ She has a smile that is winning. ⟶ She has a smile winning. ⟶ She has a winning smile.

Similarly, interesting, charming, demanding, captivating, etc.

Notice that the process, and the result, is different when verbs of this group have an object other than the above-mentioned indefinite human object: the -ing form in winning team is not an adjective in terms of the criteria listed above. Its derivation is different too:

(26) This is the team. / The team wins matches/has won a match. ⟶ This is the team that wins matches/has won a match. ⟶ This is the team that wins/has won. ⟶ This is the team winning. ⟶ This is the winning team.

This last example, despite its surface similarity with winning smile, actually belongs with (6) and (8), in which we have -ing attributives that remain verbal and that could not possibly have been derived from be-predication:

(27) All nations will support this move. / *All nations are loving peace. ⟶ *All nations that are loving peace will support this move.

Instead, the process goes through the following sentence:

(28) All nations that love peace will support this move.

from which the compound peace-loving moves straight into the attributive position. It may or may not reach the predicative position, depending on whether the compound has become sufficiently "entrenched" as an attributive [11]:

a slow-moving vehicle → the vehicle which is slow-moving; peace-loving nations → nations which are peace-loving; a star-gazing astronomer → *the astronomer who is star-gazing.

The fact that the attributive represents a potential source of predication is highly significant, because it shows that native intuitions are prepared to interpret as adjectives all those forms which are used sufficiently freely, and sufficiently long, in the attributive slot. This fact also has a theoretical significance, in that it gives weight to the traditional view of adjectives as words "added to nouns".

3.2. Serbo-Croatian admits active participles in the prenominal position only very reluctantly, if at all: očaravajući pogled, ?razoružavajući osmijeh, *osvajajući osmijeh, *sporo kretajuće se vozilo, *mir ljubeći narodi. English attributive structures discussed here find their correspondents in Serbo-Croatian attributive adjectives and, more often, relative clauses:

(6SC) Ovo je vozilo koje se kreće vrlo sporo.
(7SC) Ona ima smiješak koji osvaja.
(8SC) Svi miroljubivi narodi podržat će ovaj potez.
(8aSC) Svi narodi koji vole mir podržat će ovaj potez.

The interference of Serbo-Croatian in the learner's speech will have no drastic consequences: if the learner follows his native instinct, he will produce acceptable English sentences:

(6a) This is a vehicle that moves very slowly.

(7a) She has a smile that wins people.

(8a) All peaceful/peaceable nations will support this move.

(8b) All nations that love peace will support this move.

But he will be hampered in his efforts to acquire the idiomatic English expressions and will therefore need extra help in learning to make the transformational step that is blocked in his native language. Another point worth noting, especially in so far as it affects translation, is the fact that the Serbo-Croatian user of English will sacrifice an element of meaning by taking the available English adjective, recorded in the dictionary, instead of the more ad hoc attributive construction based on the verb phrase. This is illustrated in sentence (8a).

4. Derived attributive: nominal phrase transformation

4.1. Although superficially like (8), sentence (9) is a product of a different transformation, and the relation that holds the noun and the attributive together is fundamentally different; the attributive itself has a nominal value and it stands with the noun as its deeper prepositional complement:

(29) The operation of moving the house was completed in two days. ⟶ ?The operation of house-moving ..... ⟶ The house-moving operation.....

The prepositional bonds that have been reduced to the attributive relation can be of several kinds (both with ordinary nouns and those derived from verbs): fire-fighting equipment ⟵ equipment for fighting fires, dictating machine ⟵ machine for dictating (machine to dictate into ⟵ one dictates into a machine), word order ⟵ order of words, hand signal ⟵ signal with the hand, oil stain ⟵ stain from oil, garden party ⟵ party in a garden, farm life ⟵ life on a farm; plane trip ⟵ trip by plane, dance hall ⟵ hall for dances, stone

bridge ← bridge (made) of stone, etc.

The attributive position is the only adjectival feature that these combinations possess: they do not appear predicatively, do not accept very, do not compare, and do not coordinate with descriptive adjectives.

4.2. Their Serbo-Croatian correspondents are either nouns (with appropriate prepositions and/or in appropriate cases) or attributive adjectives derived from nouns: vatrogasna oprema and oprema za gašenje požara, stroj za diktiranje, red riječi, signal rukom, uljna mrlja and mrlja (od) ulja, vrtna zabava, život na selu, avionsko putovanje and putovanje avionom, plesna dvorana and dvorana za ples, kameni most and most od kamena.

The difficulties that the learner faces in the acquisiton of this particular structure are of two kinds: one is that he frequently fails to reach the desired transformational stage because he can stop one step below it (as he often does in his mother tongue) and still produce grammatical, though less idiomatic, strings in English; the other is that he may look for an adjective in English that would correspond to the Serbo-Croatian adjective, and either not find one (and try his luck in forming it ad hoc) or find an adjective derived from the appropriate noun but having a different meaning from the one desired: *oily stain, *stony bridge. While the first difficulty will result, at worst, in idiomatic infelicities (not at all unimportant for very advanced students and translators), the second will have a negative effect on the learner's ability to convey the desired meaning. (Even if he does not produce ungrammatical strings, he will falter while trying to find an adequate equivalent for the adjective used in his mother tongue.)

5. Kernel attributive

5.1. So far we have discussed attributives that can best be interpreted as transformationally derived. However, there are also attributives in English (as well as in Serbo-Croatian) for which a transformational derivation is difficult to formulate, and for which native intuitions are rather undecided when called upon to provide a "natural" source from which to derive them.

It can be shown that medical students does not have *students who are medical as its source (nor, for that matter, does it start from two underlying sentences: These are students and *The students are medical). In other words, the attributive here is not a descriptive adjective but rather a limiting adjective: it does not admit of comparison and coordination with descriptive adjectives, nor does it accept the intensifier very. It is not normally used predicatively: when it does reach the predicative position, this is a clear sign that the adjective has established its status in the attributive position so firmly that it can now move more freely in a new, descriptive field of meaning and that it has acquired the syntactic properties of a descriptive adjective together with its semantic features. The process goes roughly like this:

(30) The students that we have in our language course are mainly /some kind of/ students. ⟶ The students that we have in our language course are mainly medical students. ⟶ ?The students that we have in our language course are mainly medical ones. ⟶ The students that we have in our language course are mainly medical.

At this point, when a context has been found in which the adjective can be used predicatively, a possibility opens for it to develop other descriptive

qualities. Whether it will develop them or not, depends primarily on whether a need is felt for the descriptive meaning that can be derived from the limiting adjective in question. Also, the first descriptive application may be intentionally deviant (meant, for instance, to produce humorous effects), and if these "catch on" the way is open for that particular limiting adjective to become descriptive. The conversion is easier for some adjectives -- and in combination with some nouns -- than for others. Thus, a rather far-fetched context would be needed to make (31) acceptable English:

(31) ?He is a conscientious and very medical student.

while (32) is much less strained:

(32) He is a very political man -- much more political, in fact, than is good for him.

It is possible, though not equally easy in all cases, to think of situations in which adjectives in the following combinations could be made descriptive: electric traction, medical instruments, methodological remarks, chemical engineer, mathematical tables, disciplinary measures, atomic weight, industrial disputes, photographic equipment, social work, psycholinguistic studies, contrastive analysts, typographical error, nuclear scientist, mayoral candidate, etc. Such "limiting adjective + noun" collocations actually form a kind of compounds, or at least groupings that are as closely bound together as compounds; it is indicative that in our sentence (19) the adjective remains close to the noun, even though the series includes another noun, which would otherwise be the last item in a series of modifiers: steel dental instruments vs.

*dental steel instruments (the latter combination would only be possible if steel instruments was itself a compound)[12]

5.2. Serbo-Croatian uses limiting adjectives in the same way in which their English correspondents are used, that is, to express an underlying nominal relationship that happens to be expressed by an "adjective + noun" rather than a "noun + noun" combination; as Bolinger puts it[13]: "There seems to be no good reason, for example, why the Civil War had noun + noun Union Forces on one side and adj. + noun Confederate Forces on the other, or any reason besides speech level why a man with a tin hat uses construction materials while one with a cap and gown uses instructional materials -- word-formation is a transformational wilderness."

Restrictions that Serbo-Croatian imposes on the movement of limiting adjectives to the predicative position, and on their comparison and coordination with descriptive adjectives, parallel those in English, and no interference occurs in this respect. But interference does occur for other reasons -- namely, because the two languages do not always agree in when a given semantic content will be expressed nominally and when it will be expressed adjectivally. It will be seen that the problem for the learner is of the same kind, only in reverse, as that discussed in 4.2. above.

While many English adjectives of this kind have Serbo-Croatian adjectives as their correspondents, and thus presumably pose no threat to the learner's ease of expression (električna vuča, medicinski instrumenti, metodološke napomene, matematičke tablice, etc.), others have Serbo-Croatian nouns

as their correspondents (inženjer kemije, snage Konfederacije, and even kandidat za gradonačelnika, stručnjak za kontrastivnu analizu, učenjak koji se bavi nuklearnom znanošću), in which case interference can be predicted but not very easily eliminated. Just as there was nothing in 4.2. to tell the learner that gradjevni materijal should be construction material and not *constructional material, so there is no rule that he can follow here to decide that inženjer kemije should be chemical engineer and not *chemistry engineer or *engineer of chemistry. In the case of kandidat za gradonačelnika, stručnjak za kontrastivnu analizu and učenjak koji se bavi nuklearnom znanošću, the learner (and the less experienced translator) will find it difficult to produce mayoral candidate, contrastive analyst and nuclear scientist, as one readily sees when one examines translations into English made by Serbo-Croatian speakers in which expressions like candidate for mayor, expert on contrastive analysis, and scientist engaged in nuclear science abound.

5.3. Ambiguous expressions involving limiting adjectives in English are disambiguated in Serbo-Croatian; thus, our sentence (4) would yield:

(4aSC) Studenti ruskoga (jezika) sastaju se danas popodne.

(4bSC) Ruski studenti sastaju se danas popodne.

(Notice that sentence (4) is not ambiguous in English in its spoken form since the stress pattern ensures the correct interpretation, i.e. Russian students, like chemistry students = (4aSC), while Russian students, like foreign students, = (4bSC).) Sentence (4aSC) will again confront the student with the

problem discussed in 4.2. and effectively prevent him from producing sentence (4) in that meaning. Sentence (4bSC) will, on the other hand, facilitate his production of sentence (4) with this second meaning.

In some cases, Serbo-Croatian makes a formal distinction between a descriptive adjective and its limiting counterpart, where English has only one lexical item for both uses: musical instruments and musical voice have the same attributive adjective although its semantico-syntactic interpretation is different in the first case (where it is limiting) from that of the second (where it is descriptive). Serbo-Croatian has muzički instrumenti (*muzikalni instrumenti) and muzikalan glas (*muzički glas). In other cases, English makes the distinction and Serbo-Croatian does not: human body vs. his deeply humane feelings will give ljudsko tijelo and njegovi duboko ljudski osjećaji. But the situation is far from simple, because Serbo-Croatian has the adjective human at its disposal to correspond to the English humane, and humane socialism can only be humani socijalizam and not *ljudski socijalizam. Both languages make the distinction in the case of urban vs. urbane: Serbo-Croatian correspondents of the former are urbani, gradski, urbanistički, while the latter finds its equivalents in fin, ugladjen.

5.4. This group of kernel adjectives also includes those like main, chief, mere, sheer, utter, only, gala, which are used only attributively (and are defective in other respects too) but for which no obvious transformational explanation can be found.

Their Serbo-Croatian counterparts are also attributive: glavni, običan, čisti, krajnji, jedini, gala. While glavni zadaci (chief, main tasks) can give ovi su zadaci glavni, obično dijete (mere child) does not give *dijete je obično, nor does čista glupost (sheer nonsense) give *glupost je čista, or gala predstava (gala performance) *predstava je gala.

6. Postnominal modification

6.1. Both English and Serbo-Croatian attributive adjectives can, under certain conditions, occupy the postnominal position. One such condition is that of indefiniteness (indicated by an indefinite pronoun), as illustrated in our example (11) above and its Serbo-Croatian translation:

(11SC) Jeste li opazili nešto neobično?

In both languages, the process of transformation in this case begins with the predicative use and ends with the postnominal attributive use, while the prenominal use is blocked:

(33) Did you notice INDEF PRON?
INDEF PRON was odd.
→ Did you notice INDEF PRON that was odd? → Did you notice anything that was odd? → Did you notice anything odd? → *Did you notice odd anything?

(33SC) Jeste li opazili INDEF PRON?
INDEF PRON je bilo neobično.
→ Jeste li opazili INDEF PRON što je bilo neobično? → Jeste li opazili nešto što je bilo neobično? → Jeste li opazili nešto neobično? → *Jeste li opazili neobično nešto?

Serbo-Croatian learners of English will therefore have no difficulty in mastering the postnominal use of adjectives with indefinite pronouns, e.g. somebody young, something expensive, nothing new, everything necessary, etc.

6.2. Our sentence (12), while illustrating the postnominal use of adjectives with indefinite nouns (notice that the definite article is ruled out here: *I bought the book yellow with age), is also an example of the operation of a transformational rule common to the two languages. The rule blocks the prenominal transformation of prepositionally expanded adjectives:

(34) I bought a book.
The book was yellow with age. → I bought a book which was yellow with age. → I bought a book yellow with age. → *I bought a yellow book with age. (*I bought a yellow with age book.)

(34SC) Kupio sam knjigu.
Knjiga je bila žuta od starosti. → Kupio sam knjigu koja je bila žuta od starosti. → Kupio sam knjigu žutu od starosti. → *Kupio sam žutu knjigu od starosti. (*Kupio sam žutu od starosti knjigu.)
/This last sentence is not grammatical when taken as an unmarked expression./

Sentence (13) shows the same rule at work, and (13a) is ungrammatical:

(13a) *These are peculiar trends to this country.

But interestingly enough, Serbo-Croatian accepts both (13SC) and (13aSC):

(13SC) Ova su kretanja karakteristična za našu zemlju.

(13aSC) Ovo su karakteristična kretanja za našu zemlju.

The separation of the adjective and its prepositional complement is possible in English too, when the adjective is qualified by an intensifier:

(35) This is an apartment too large for a single person.
This is too large an apartment for a single person.

Notice that the intensifier too necessitates the movement of the adjective in front of the article; (35a) is ungrammatical:

(35a) *This is a too large apartment for a single person.

When the intensifier is very or enough, the adjective follows the article and precedes the noun:

(36) He is a man old enough to know better. → He is an old enough man to know better.

(37) This is a language very easy to learn if you know Latin. → This is a very easy language to learn if you know Latin.

These examples already show that the rule blocking the prenominal transformation of prepositionally expanded adjectives fails to operate in all those cases in which the prepositional complement is either related to the intensifier rather than to the adjective (too Adj for, Adj enough to) or is otherwise not indispensable for the semantic interpretation of the adjective (This is a very easy language and This is a very easy language to learn have the same adjective easy; the adjective peculiar in These are peculiar trends and These trends are peculiar to this country is used in two different senses; this explains also why the separation is possible with karakterističan in Serbo-Croatian: the semantic interpretation of the adjective does not change from (13SC) to (13aSC); it would not be possible, for instance, with osebujan

as an equivalent of peculiar). This latter explanation is also offered for those cases in which the separation occurs even when no intensifier accompanies the adjective:

(37a) This is a language easy to learn if you know Latin.
⟶ This is an easy language to learn if you know Latin.

It follows from what has been said here that the problem of prenominal shifting of prepositionally expanded adjectives depends on whether the adjective with its prepositional phrase denotes a temporary quality (in which case it must remain in the postnominal position) while its unexpanded counterpart (in the prenominal position) has a different meaning and denotes a permanent quality. In short, when the adjectival feature 'temporary/permanent' is affected by prepositional expansion, the shift to prenominal position is not allowed; when the feature remains unaffected, the adjective moves readily. It is clear now why *a willing girl to marry, *a ready man to fight for his principles, *a desirous man of success, *an acceptable solution to me are intuitively rejected while a comfortable chair to sit on, an interesting place to visit, an impossible man to live with, a fine girl for the job are as acceptable as a comfortable chair, an interesting place, an impossible man, a fine girl.

The principle of adjective movement described here for English is also valid for Serbo-Croatian:

(35SC) Ovo je stan prevelik za jednu osobu. ⟶ Ovo je prevelik stan za jednu osobu.

(36SC) On je čovjek dovoljno star da zna da to tako ne ide.
⟶ On je dovoljno star čovjek da zna da to tako ne ide.

No interference is therefore predicted in the learner's speech as far as this particular phenomenon is concerned. However, two difficulties appear in connection with this feature from another source: one is that Serbo-Croatian equivalents of certain English adjectives may react differently to the 'temporary/permanent' criterion than do their English counterparts (cf. peculiar vs. karakterističan; notice that other equivalents of peculiar, such as osebujan or svojstven, behave in the same way as the English adjective); the other difficulty is that the question of adjective position may not even arise for the student because his mother tongue will suggest structures in which the attributive adjective does not figure at all and the teacher's job will be to try to accustom the learner to render such structures by the English attributive (prenominal or postnominal) construction:

(37SC) Ovo je jezik koji je lako naučiti ako znate latinski.
Ovo je jezik koji se lako (na)uči ako znate latinski.
Ovaj je jezik lako naučiti ako znate latinski.
Ovaj se jezik lako nauči ako znate latinski.
Ovaj je jezik lagan za učenje ako znate latinski.

The Serbo-Croatian sentence that would bring the learner closest to the target English sentence is also the least likely: Ovo je jezik lagan za učenje ako znate latinski.

6.3. English adjectives can also stand postnominally when they are not expanded by prepositional phrases but are qualified in other ways; the prenominal transformation is possible in such cases:

(38) A story as improbable as that is difficult to swallow.
→ As improbable a story as that is difficult to swallow.

(39) Only a man so rich can afford to be so extravagant. ⟶ Only so rich a man can afford to be so extravagant.

(40) She's never had a boyfriend that young. ⟶ She's never had that young a boyfriend.

In Serbo-Croatian, the postnominal position is marginally possible, but the *prenominal position is the normal one -- and the learner's* attention will have to be specially drawn to the possibility of postnominal use (i.e., to the fact that the transformational step into the prenominal field, which is almost obligatory in Serbo-Croatian, is optional in English):

(38SC) ? Priča ovako nevjerojatna teško se može progutati. (? Priču ovako malo vjerojatnu teško je progutati.) ⟶ Ovako nevjerojatna priča teško se može progutati. (Ovako malo vjerojatnu priču teško je progutati.)

(39SC) ? Samo čovjek tako bogat može sebi dozvoliti ovakvu rasipnost. ⟶ Samo tako bogat čovjek može sebi dozvoliti ovakvu rasipnost.

(40SC) ? Ona nije još nikada imala momka ovako mladog. ⟶ Ona nije još nikada imala ovako mladog momka.

6.4. Certain unexpanded and unqualified adjectives in -ble follow nouns in English when these nouns are already modified by superlatives, ordinal numerals and limiting words such as only: the only person visible, the best government imaginable, the highest degree possible, the first train available. The prenominal position is also possible: the only visible person, the best imaginable government, the highest possible degree, the first available train. Serbo-Croatian allows only the prenominal use (jedina vidljiva osoba, najbolja zamisliva vlada, najveći mogući stupanj, prvi raspoloživi vlak) to correspond to the English prenominal construction; the English postnominal construction

finds its correspondent in the relative clause with the verb based on the English adjective: jedina osoba koju smo vidjeli, najbolja vlada koju možemo zamisliti, najviši stupanj koji je moguć, prvi vlak koji je mogao uhvatiti. The relative construction can be expected to interfere in the acquisition of the noun plus adjective structure.

Notice that the postnominal pattern is followed only by those English adjectives in -ble which are not strictly descriptive: they lack certain adjectival properties (e.g. comparison and acceptance of the intensifier very), and it is also significant that their relative-clause correspondents in Serbo-Croatian are verbs, not adjectives. Adjectives in -ble without these restrictions, as well as their Serbo-Croatian equivalents, occupy the prenominal position: remarkable achievement - izvanredno ostvarenje, valuable contribution - vrijedan doprinos.

6.5. A limited number of English adjectives are used postnominally in more or less stereotyped collocations: money due, adjectives proper, Asia Minor. Their Serbo-Croatia correspondents are prenominal adjectives (dužni iznos, pravi pridjevi, Mala Azija), or the whole collocation is syntatically resolved (novac koji treba platiti). Such collocations are best taught as lexical units, not as free constructions.

The same is true of certain limiting adjectives of Romance origin used in stock expressions such as secretary general, court martial, time immemorial, proof positive. Adjectives in these expressions are not free elements but rather parts of compound nouns: they are often written with a hyphen, and court

martial even has a possible plural form court martials. In Serbo-Croatian, their correspondents have prenominal adjectives (generalni sekretar, ratni sud, pradavna vr[illegible]na, neoborivi dokaz) and to that extent interference can be predicted. It can also be predicted when the corresponding Serbo-Croatian expression is a juxtaposition of two nouns (knight errant - vitez lutalica) or a nominal compound (heir apparent - prijestolonasljednik).

6.6. In both English and Serbo-Croatian, appositive adjectives -- usually two or more of them in coordination -- are used postnominally:

(41) A laugh, musical but malicious, was heard from the other room.

(41SC) Smijeh, zvonak ali zloban, čuo se iz druge sobe.

7. Prenominal ordering of adjectives

7.1. Several adjectives can modify one and the same noun, and it is then that the question of their ordering arises [14]

7.2. When several adjectives appear prenominally as modifiers of a single noun, two possibilities arise [15] : first, the adjectives are independent of one another, and second, they form an unbroken string in which the adjectives modify each other in addition to modifying the head noun.

In the first case, the transformational history of the sentence can be traced back to as many predicative constructions as there are attributive adjectives; thus:

(42) The house is beautiful.
The house is white.
The house is old. } ⟶ The house is old, white and beautiful. ⟶ This is an old, white and beautiful house.

The adjectives are separated from each other by commas and/or conjunctions to indicate that they are parallel and not hierarchically ordered.

The only principle of ordering in this case, both in the predicative and the attributive position, is the one which arranges the adjectives from shortest to longest [16]. In Serbo-Croatian the same principle is at work, as can be demonstrated by the following sentence:

(43SC) Jedan mlad, načitan i inteligentan čovjek shvatit će da .....

In order to appreciate the difference between such strings of coordinated prenominal adjectives and the unbroken, subordinated strings, it is important to realize that the transformation affects all of the adjectives involved at once; thus:

(44) The man was young and interesting. ⟶ He was a young and interesting man. (or: He was a young, interesting man.)

The transformation does not take the adjectives in turn, which would at once introduce a hierarchical relationship:

(44a) The man was young and interesting. ⟶ The young man was interesting. ⟶ *He was a young interesting man.

7.3. The unbroken, subordinated prenominal string, on the other hand, is characterized precisely by this hierarchical relationship among the adjectives:

(45) The man was young.
The man was nice. } ⟷ The man (the man was young) was nice. ⟶ The man who was young was nice. ⟶ The young man was nice. ... a nice young man...

The underlying sentence here is not

(46) The man was young and nice.

nor is a nice young man the same as a young and nice man. The order is strictly fixed, and *a young nice man is not allowed.

Similarly, in our sentence (42) adjectives can be hierarchically ordered to give (47):

(47) This is a beautiful old white house.

where again permutations are not allowed because beautiful does not modify only house but old white house, and old modifies white house, not just house. Notice that all these adjectives are descriptive and that their relative order is determined by the relation of their semantic content to the semantic content of all the other adjectives in the series and of the head noun. According to A.A. Hill [17], descriptive adjectives are group III and group II of his six-group modifier scheme. They follow definitives and number terms and precede limiting adjectives and adjunct nouns. Group III is an open set and it precedes group II, which contains closed-set adjectives.

The subsets of group II are adjectives of size, shape, age, colour -- and they usually appear in that particular relative order. The reversal of age and colour is possible, especially when an adjective like young or old forms a closely bound collocation: a dark young man. Z. Vendler [18] has a more elaborate classification. According to him, prenominal adjectives appear in the following "natural" order: (1) exclamatory adjectives (those that can occur as one-word exclamations, e.g. beautiful, lovely, nice, awful, good), (2) adverb-like adjectives (those that can function as adverbs without any adverbial

suffix and that have polar opposites, e.g. big - small, long - short, young - old, thick - thin, etc.), (3) verb-like adjectives (mainly present and past participles), (4) noun-like adjectives (those derived from nouns and capable of forming adverbs, e.g. bulky; those that can be used as nouns, e.g. yellow; those that are derived from nouns but cannot form adverbs, e.g. catlike; and those that are derived from nouns but can still be used as nouns, e.g. American). S.S. Annear [19] gives rules for three kinds of modifiers -- those derived from relative clauses, those derived by nominalization, and those inserted by constituent-structure rules. Her conclusion is that the ordering of transformationally derived modifiers (the first two types) is not a grammatical phenomenon but a stylistic convention, while the ordering of constituent-structure modifiers is done according to the semantic classes to which they correspond. It appears therefore that semantic classification, combined with the concept of open and closed sets, is best suited for all pedagogical purposes. The corpus is expected to show in more detail how Serbo-Croatian treats extended prenominal strings of descriptive adjectives, but my experience with the limited number of examples (natural examples of long strings are difficult to find and even more difficult to concoct) and with the performance of our students is that the two languages follow much the same rules -- which is not surprising if the rules are indeed deep seated (perhaps universal) semantic rules.

7.4. The preceding discussion concerned only descriptive adjectives of the kind illustrated in our sentence (16). As a group, these precede limiting

adjectives and adjunct nouns. In our example (17) the reversal of the two adjectives is not possible:

(17a) *What she feels for him is nothing but a personal deep animosity.

Similarly, with other limiting adjectives we do not get *medical new instruments, *disciplinary strong measures, *a typographical unimportant error, *atomic characteristic weight, etc. Sentence (20) shows that the reverse ordering becomes possible when the adjective changes class.

Serbo-Croatian limiting adjectives follow the same pattern and the following combinations are ungrammatical: *medicinski novi instrumenti, *disciplinske stroge mjere, *tiskarska nevažna pogreška, *atomska karakteristična težina [20]

Adjunct nouns normally follow all other modifiers and occupy the slot immediately preceding the head noun. (The same slot is occupied by noun-like material adjectives, such as wooden, silken, golden.) However, when a limiting adjective and a head noun form a close, compound-like combination, the adjunct noun moves before the adjective; cf. (19) above. The same is true of its Serbo-Croatian counterpart if it happens to be a noun-based adjective:

(19SC) Zanimljivo je da je čelična zubarska oprema naš vodeći izvozni proizvod.

If it is rendered as a noun, the problem of ordering does not arise:

(19aSC) Zanimljivo je da je zubarska oprema od čelika naš vodeći izvozni proizvod.

7.5. It should be noted that the rules of ordering discussed here do not apply to adjectives that are used adverbially to qualify other adjectives: real nice, red hot, dark blue, etc.

NOTES

1. This paper will deal only with syntactic aspects of attributive use of adjectives. For a brief sketch of the equally important, and no less vexed, phonological aspects see W. Brown's "Notes on Adjectives and Stress" in this volume. A separate, full-scale study of stress patterns for adjectives in English and Serbo-Croatian is still awaited.

2. Goold Brown, The Grammar of English Grammars, William Wood, New York, 1878, p. 268.

3. Charles C. Fries, The Structure of English, Longmans, London, 1957, p. 82.

4. Noam Chomsky, Syntactic Structures, Mouton, The Hague, 1957, p. 72.

5. Noam Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1965, p. 217, note 26.

6. Goold Brown, op. cit., p. 270.

7. Dwight Bolinger, "Adjectives in Englsih: Attribution and Predication", Lingua, 18, 1967, p. 8.

8. ibid. pp. 10-14.

9. ibid., p. 11.

10. cf. V. Ivir, "Adjective coordination in English, Studia romanica et anglica zagrabiensia, 21/22, Zagreb 1966, 113-125; "Very as a Criterion of Structure", SRAZ, 23, Zagreb 1967, 63-74.

11. Dwight Bolinger, op. cit., p. 7.

12. Notice that because household appliances and electrical appliances can both be regarded as compound-like structures, the series can be ordered in two ways: electrical household appliances (assuming that electrical household is not itself a compound) and household electrical appliances. Similarly in Serbo-Croatian, where both modifiers are limiting adjectives: električni kućanski aparati and kućanski električni aparati.

13. Op. cit., p. 31, note 20.

14. The present paper will confine itself to a discussion of the relative ordering of adjectives proper, leaving out the wider question of the ordering of elements within the nominal group, for which see V. Suzanić, "The Nominal Group in English and Serbo-Croatian", in R. Filipović (ed.), Reports 1, The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, Zagreb 1969, 51-62.

15. Cf. Z. Vendler, Order of Adjectives, University of Pennsylvania, Transformation and Discourse Analysis Papers, #31, 1961, pp. 2-3.

16. The principle is a rather subtle one and not very rigid. Also, it depends not only on the number of syllables but also on vowel length, stress and other considerations of sentence rhythm. Changes in the preferred order do not produce ungrammatical strings but rather subtle modifications of meaning (shift of emphasis, etc.).

17. A.A. Hill, Introduction to Linguistic Structures, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1958, pp. 173-190.

18. Op. cit., p. 9.

19. "The Ordering of Pre-Nominal Modifiers in English", The Ohio State University Research Foundation, Project on Linguistic Analysis, Report No. 8, 1964, p. 95-121.

20. In poetic language the reversal is possible; cf. the title of a folk song O jesenske duge noći. It is also possible when the two adjectives are made to be independent of each other: jesenske, duge noći. However, this has no contrastive significance because there is little likelihood that the learner may model his speech on this pattern.

Wayles Brown (University of Zagreb)

NOTES ON ADJECTIVES AND STRESS

One topic not covered in V. Ivir's paper "Attributive patterns for English adjectives and their contrastive correspondents in Serbo-Croatian" (except for one remark) is the accent of adjective-noun groups. But this is an area which cannot help creating difficulties for learners of English, and so a little attention should be devoted to it. The most typical pattern in E is like the SC pattern: with main stress on the noun. For example, mala soba, a small room, kontrastivna analiza, contrastive analysis, ruski studenti, Russian students. This pattern is only one special case of a more general regularity: the last element of a construction gets the main stress. Thus Institut za lingvistiku, Institute of Linguistics, 30. travnja, April thirtieth, the thirtieth of April, SSSR, the U.S.S.R., Nikola Tesla, Thomas A. Edison. However, under some circumstances English departs from this pattern.

1. A noun compound, i.e. two nouns which together make up a single noun, normally has the main stress on the first member: chemistry book, the Prague School, heart disease, prison term, philosophy student, Russian student (i.e. student of Russian), apple cake, surface structure. (There are, however, a large number of exceptions, in which the general regularity applies: apple pie, family circle, Boston University.) Some groups which are in fact A-N groups

and not noun compounds have this pattern as well: high school, medical student, dental instruments, deep structure, hot dog, advisory board. The degree of lexicalization seems to be one factor influencing whether an A-N group will have this pattern or not, but there are evidently other factors as well. Cf. Selective Service (the military conscription system in the U.S.), the Pragmatic Sanction, which appear to be just as highly lexicalized as high school and the like.

2. An element will get main stress if it is in contrast with another. Students from Russia are Russian students, but one must say: The Russian students and the French students (or: the students from France, or: those from France) came late. The normal pattern is attributive adjective, but: Some attributive adjectives come from predicative position. Contrastive stress may have been the origin of the stress pattern of some of the AN groups under 1) above: high school was opposed to grammar school, deep structure to surface structure. Now, however, they have become lexicalized with this stress pattern, and have it even when no contrast is thought of.

My impression is that contrastive stress is usual but not obligatory in SC. In E it is obligatory as soon as the contrast has been established. One might begin the sentence cited by saying: Some attributive adjectives... but it would be completely impossible to continue by saying *come from predicative position. English-speakers find lack of contrastive stress one of the most noticable characteristics of a French or Spanish accent, or of a radio announcer who has not read his material before going on the air.

Connected with contrastive stress, at least logically, is emphatic stress, since emphasis usually requires an implied contrast. The normal stress (a superficial glance) would not be used in the sentence: Even a superficial glance at the sentences given here will show... (as distinguished, perhaps, from a careful glance).

3. An element which would normally get main stress will become destressed if it is a repetition of an element previously mentioned: YOUR IDEA IS AN INTERESTING idea, BUT HIS is an interesting idea TOO. The words written in small letters in this sentence have all been destressed by this rule. It applies to V. Ivir's sentence (5): one normally says medical instruments, but this sentence is pronounced MEDICAL STUDENTS MUST LEARN TO HANDLE medical INSTRUMENTS. (This rule is not understood very well yet. A colleague points out that one says Medical students go to medical school, with no destressing possible.) Anaphoric destressing is, so to speak, the other side of the coin of contrastive stressing.

It seems reasonable to recommend that A-N groups (and other sorts of groups) with unusual stress patterns should be taught together with those stress patterns. For this purpose, a simple notation should be employed, one that can be used easily by teachers and learners as well as by textbook and dictionary writers. The use of single and double underlines, as in this note, is clear, but shows more information than is strictly necessary. All that is needed is an accent mark (') on one of the words of the group to indicate the main stress: small róom, Thomas A. Édison, chémistry book, prison term,

family círcle, hígh school, médical student. In fact, there is usually no need to indicate final stress, given that it is the unmarked pattern in both languages: thus we can write simply "small room, contrastive analysis, Thomas A. Edison". We will, however, have to write "apple píe, family círcle", etc., to insure that these are not taken to be normal nóun compounds.

If this system is used to write continuous text, one should distinguish the stréss pattern which is characteristic for a given group from the stress the group gets because of contrastive stress or destressing. The áccent mark can be retained for inherent stress, and an underline used for contrastive stress. For destressing, a dotted underline might be used. It will sometimes be necessary to put accents on two or more neighboring words. Thus the contrast "péace-loving" vs. "slow-móving" must be shown; when "péace-loving" is put together with "nation", we can write "péace-loving nátion" and take advantage of the principle that the main stress is on the last element.

Vjekoslav Suzanić (Faculty of Philosophy, Zadar)

ONE: ITS FORMS AND USES

In the analysis which follows, one is treated as a single item having several grammatical functions.

1.1. One is the lowest cardinal numeral, used to express a definite number. The Serbo-Croatian (SC) lexical equivalent of the numeral one is usually jedan or its inflected forms.

1.2. One is an indefinite pronoun with personal connotation. Morphologically it can be grouped with other pronouns loosely referring to 'person'. Archaic forms, non-standard or dialect forms are not listed.

I	me	my	mine	myself	
you	you	your	yours	yourself	yourselves
he	him	his	his	himself	
she	her	her	hers	herself	
it	it	its	its	itself	
we	us	our	ours		ourselves
they	them	their	theirs		themselves
who	whom	whose	whose		
one	one	one's		oneself	

The SC lexical equivalent of the indefinite pronoun one is almost never 'jedan'.

1.3. One occurs as the second element of compound indefinite pronouns after some, any, n(o), every.

1.4. One is a prop-word, representing a countable noun in the context. In this function it is inflected (one's, ones, ones' and can assume most of the

formal characteristics of nouns: it can be preceded by deicts (determiners), positives, comparatives, and superlatives of adjectives, etc.; it can be followed by clauses, infinitives, etc.

The SC lexical equivalent of the prop-word one is almost never jedan.

2. The Numerical Uses of One.

One is used to express a definite number or the notion of an indefinite, usually small, number.

2.1.1. One is used before singular countable nouns, operating at modifier (M) in the structure of the nominal group (NG). It is also used at head (H) when the referent can be understood from the context.

Its SC lexical equivalent is jedan.

(1) One (man) in ten.
(1SC) Jedan (čovjek) od deset.

However, 1SC is a word-for-word translation. A more idiomatic, better, and probably more frequent translation is

(1SCa) Svaki deseti (čovjek).

(2) One will do.
(2SC) Jedan je dosta.

2.1.2. As with other cardinal numerals, the noun can be omitted in expressions of time and value.

(3) It's five to one.
(3SC) (Sada je) jedan manje pet.

(4) One and six. (sc. shilling)
(4SC) Jedan šiling i šest penija.

(5) The score is three to one.
(5SC) Rezultat je tri (prema) jedan.

2.1.3. Like other units, one follows the tens; but it may occasionally precede, and is stylistically marked. The noun can be omitted. The units in SC normally follow the tens.

(6) Twenty-one.
(6SC) Dvadeset (i) jedan.

(7) One and twenty.
(7SC) Dvadeset i jedan.

In such constructions English has plural concord within the NG, i.e. the concord is semantic. In SC it is formal in that it corresponds to the last word of the numerical expression of the type (6SC)

(8) Twenty-one boys
(8SC) Dvadeset i jedan dječak.

A word-for-word translation of expressions illustrated by type (7) is used in SC in expressions denoting distance, length, weight, etc., in which the first numeral refers to a higher unit, and the second, usually separated by the conjunction i, a lower unit. Thus jedan i dvadeset can be translated, depending on the context, as twenty past one or as one pound and twenty pence (one twenty) or one metre and twenty centimetres, etc.

2.1.4. The noun is omitted in some colloquial and slangy expressions.

(9) Give him one (sc. a blow, a punch, etc.) on the nose.
(9SC) Daj mu jednu po nosu.

It seems that in SC in such constructions feminine gender is used exclusively:

2.1.5. When one occurs before a personal name; it refers to an individual, thus approaching the meaning of a certain or of the individualizing indefinite article before a personal name.

(10) One Mr. Smith wants to see you.

The SC lexical equivalent is neki, nekakav (western variant) and neki, nekakav, izvjestan (eastern variant).

(10SC) Traži vas neki Mr. Smith.

2.1.6. Three constructions occur in negative contexts. The noun can be omitted in all three.

(a) Not one has a general connotation.

(11) Not one boy knows the answer.

The SC lexical equivalent is ni jedan, niti jedan, ni jedan jedini.

(11SC) Ni jedan jedini dječak ne zna odgovora.

(b) No one with the stress on the negative approaches the meaning of nobody and none. While no one individualizes, nobody and none do not specify.

(12) I read three books on the subject, no one of which was helpful.

The SC lexical equivalent is nijedan, which individualizes, and nitko (used only as a pronoun) which does not specify.

(12SC) Pročitao sam tri knjige od kojih nijedna nije koristila.

(c) No one with the stress on one. The degree of individualization is stronger that in (b).

(13) No 'one runner could build a lead.

The SC lexical equivalent is ni 'jedan, which has a strong individualizing force.

(13SC) Ni jedan trkač nije uspio izbiti u vodstvo.

2.1.7. The phrase one or two refers to an indefinite small number.

(14) How many do you want?
Just one or two.

SC has an analogous construction:

(14SC) Koliko želite?
(Samo) jedan ili dva.

However, other translation equivalents of the whole phrase are possible:

Nekoliko.

Par komada.

2.2.1. There are some borderline cases in which the numeral one approaches, or even acquires, the force of the indefinite pronoun one. When used anaphorically, one often has a demonstrative or determinative value.

(15) The work is done by one or another of his children.

(15SC) Posao obavlja ovo ili ono od njegove djece.

This type refers to two individuals or perhaps more.

(16) One king after another succeeded to the throne.

(16SC) Na prijestolje je dolazio jedan kralj za drugim.

This type refers to more than two individuals.

(17) ... one layer overlapping the other ...

(17SC) ... jedan sloj djelomično pokriva drugi ...

(18) The two men represented two tendencies: the one a tendency towards mechanism, the other, one towards humanism.

(18SC) Ta dva čovjeka su bili predstavnici dviju (različitih) tendencija: prvi, mehaničkog shvatanja stvari, a drugi, humanističkog shvatanja stvari.

Both types (17) and (18) refer to two. (It should be noted that (17) may imply more than two, but two are contrasted). If the order is irrelevant, one is not used with the definite article, as in (17); if the order is important, the article is used, as in (18) and the one and the other are synonymous with the former and the latter respectively.

The SC learner might fail to notice the difference between (17) and (18). One of type (17) is translated jedan; one of type (18) is translated prvi, occasionally jedan which is perhaps less natural.

2.2.2. The phrase for one is used after the noun it specifies. When it is used in sentences expressing comparison or enumeration it is synonymous with the former.

(19) Mr. X for one and Mr. Y for another...

The SC equivalent of the phrase is kao jedan, kao prvi.

(19SC) Gosp. X kao jedan/prvi a gosp. Y kao drugi...

When no comparison is expressed, for one is synonymous with e.g., for instance, for example, as an instance, etc.

(20) John knows it, for one.

(21) I for one do not agree.

The SC translation equivalents are determined contextually.

(20SC) Ivan zna, na primjer. / Ivan svakako zna.

(21SC) Ja se sa svoje strane ne slažem.

3. The Indefinite Pronoun One

3.1. One can be an indefinite pronoun signifying 'I and others', thus approaching the generic meaning of we, you, they, or the passive construction.

(22) One cannot fail to see...

It can be used with true or assumed modesty instead of I.

(23) If one may be allowed to say...

The SC lexical equivalent of one in such construction is čovjek, svatko, nitko, or the reflexive form of the SC verb, depending on the context. The choice of the translation equivalent will probably depend on the stylistic level of discourse. The translations which follow are arranged in ascending order of formality.

(22SCa) Svatko mora vidjeti...
(22SCb) Čovjek ne može a da ne vidi...
(22SCc) Nitko ne može a da ne vidi...
(22SCd) Ne može se previdjeti...

(23SCa) Ako čovjek može reći...
(23SCb) Ako se može reći...
(23SCc) Ako bi se moglo reći...
(23SCd) Ako mi dopustite da kažem...
(23SCe) Neka mi bude dopušteno reći...

Since SC lacks a pronoun of this character, learners will find it difficult to master this use of one. Thus the learner might translate the SC examples (22, 23) word for word into English with a result that is certainly less idiomatic, to say the least.

(22a) Everybody must see...

(22b) A man cannot but see...

(22c) *Nobody cannot but see...

(22d) It cannot be overlooked...

(23a) If a man can say/state...

(23b) If it can be said...

(23c) If it could be said...

(23d) If you allow me to say/If I am allowed to say...

(23e) Let me be allowed to say...

3.2. The genitive one's can be used as a generic possessive adjective.

(24) It's difficult to make up one's mind in this matter.

(24SC) Teško je odlučiti (se) u ovoj stvari.

SC learners might use some specific possessive, usually his or their, instead of the generic one's, probably on the analogy of such instances as the following:

(25) It's difficult for him to make up his mind.

The SC equivalent is

(25SC) Teško mu je da se odluči / odlučiti se.

3.3. The reflexive oneself is used generically.

(26) It's not always easy to behave oneself.

(26SC) Nije uvijek lako ponašati se pristojno.

SC learners may replace oneself with some specific self-form. It seems that such examples are best treated lexically.

3.4. One another is used as a reciprocal pronoun referring to more than two, also occasionally to two. The construction also occurs as a group genitive.

(27) ... she hears them gossiping about one another just as spitefully as usual.

(28) The two little boys were lying in one another's arms.

The SC lexical equivalent is jedan ... drugi in the appropriate case and gender form, or the reflexive particle se.

(27SC) ... (ona) čuje kako ogovaraju jedna drugu pakosno kao uvijek. / kako se ogovaraju

(28SC) Ona dva dječaka ležala su jedan drugom u zagrljaju.

However, when referring to two, each other and each other's are more common.

3.5. One occurs as the second element of compound indefinite pronouns. The paradigm has some-, any-, every-, no- as the first element and -one, -body, -thing as the second element. There is a similar paradigm in SC, which is more complex: it has i-, ni-, ne-, sva-, koje-, što-, gdje- as the first element and -tko (western), -ko (eastern), -što, (-šta), -koji, -čiji, -kakav, -kolik as the second element; additionally, the items used as the second element can be used as first elements in combination with -god. Whereas in English all items listed as first elements combine freely with all items listed as second elements, there are some restrictions in SC. The matter is discussed in the paper on "Indefinites".

The most usual translation equivalent of one is tko/ko, except in the case of none (and no one) where it is translated nitko, nijedan, ni jedan.

4. . The Prop-Word One

One can be used as a prop-word, a suffix-like element, representing a countable noun in the context. There is always, or nearly always, a particular noun in the speaker's or writer's mind when the prop-word is used.

4.1. Very often the noun has been used shortly before and the prop-word is a kind of substitute for it.

(29) Could I have a cup of coffee, a large one, please.
(29SC) Mogu li dobiti šalicu kave, (jednu) veliku.

(30) Among his books were a number of very cheap ones.
(30SC) Medju njegovim knjigama bilo je vrlo jeftinih.

The SC lexical equivalent of the prop-word is the definite form of the adjective, used absolutely. In the singular only, jedan can be used with the adjective. In SC the noun is not repeated, and the learner will have to remember to use one in the appropriate form.

4.2. The prop-word one operates at the head (H) in the structure of the NG. It is preceded by modifier (M); it can be followed by qualifiers (Q). When used at H, one always occurs with M or Q, or both.

4.2.1. When one is used with the definite article or with the demonstrative pronoun, it often has determinative force. The individual or the group denoted by one and ones is marked off as excluded from a larger, often indefinite, group or unit, especially when one is used non-anaphorically.

(31) I'd like that one.

(32) ... that very old and familiar one...

(33) That's the one.

(34) The loved one.

(35) The poor ones.

The SC equivalent is the demonstrative pronoun or/and the definite form of the adjective, where applicable, used independently.

(31SC) Htio bih/hoću ovoga.

(32SC) ... onaj stari i poznati...

(33SC) To je taj.

(34SC) (Onaj) voljeni.

(35SC) (Oni) siromašni/ Siromasi.

4.2.2. When preceded by the indefinite article or a numeral, plus an adjective, one has individualizing force.

(36) ... a good one...

(37) ... one good one...

(38) ... three new ones...

The SC equivalent is the definite form of the adjective.

(36SC) (37SC) .... jedan dobri..

(38SC) ... tri nova...

4.2.3. Instances with one preceded by the indefinite article alone[1], with a qualifier, seem to be rare and archaic. One refers to a person and the construction has ironic overtones.

(39) You are a one indeed!

(40) You are a one to keep company!

The nearest lexical equivalent is neki, netko, but the construction is best treated as an individual idiomatic expression and each instance treated separately.

(39SC) I ti si mi neki!

(40SCa) I ti si mi netko za društvo!

(40SCb) I ti si mi neko/nekakvo društvo!

4.2.4. When one is preceded by such a, it can be used anaphorically or non-anaphorically. The SC lexical equivalent is usually takav, but jedan or nešto can be used because the construction is used of a noun in the singular.

(41) I've never heard of such a one.

(41SCa) Nikad nisam čuo o takvom.

(41SCb) Nikad nisam čuo o jednom takvom.

4.2.5. One occurs with a qualifier, but without a modifier, when it represents a noun in the singular, and has personal denotation.

(42) A politician is one who can get himself elected.

(43) One in great trouble.

(44) One so much younger.

The SC lexical equivalent is netko, osoba, čovjek.

(42SC) Političar je osoba koja se da izabrati.

(43SC) Netko u velikoj nevolji.

(44SC) Netko toliko mladji.

4.2.6. One preceded by the definite article and followed by a qualifier is frequent. Instances with adjectives between the and one(s) are rare. As a recent innovation, the article can be omitted. It seems that the adjective is not necessary as the referent of one is made definite by the qualifier, usually a relative clause or a prepositional phrase.

(45) The annoying guest is the one who begins telling an interesting story but never quite finishes it.

(46) The only one in the room...

(47) The one on your list...

(48) This is one that cannot be replaced.

(49) These are ones that cannot be replaced.

In such instances the SC lexical equivalents are noun + koji, jedan, onaj koji, jedini (koji), also čovjek, ljudi when referring to persons.

(45SC) Dosadan gost je onaj koji počinje pričati zanimljivu priču ali je nikada zapravo ne završi.

(46SC) Jedini u sobi...

(47SC) Onaj (koji je) na tvom spisku...

(48SCa) Ovo je jedan koji se ne da zamijeniti.

(48SCb) Ovo je onaj koji se ne da zamijeniti.

(48SCc) Ovo je dio koji se ne može zamijeniti.

(49SCa) Ovo su oni koji se ne mogu zamijeniti.

(49SCb) Ovo su dijelovi koji se ne mogu zamijeniti.

(49SCc) Ovo su ljudi koji se ne mogu zamijeniti

4.2.7. The genitives one's and ones' occur at M with individualizing value.

(50) ... a poor gentlewoman... this one's father has turned his back upon her.

(51) The little ones' eyes filled with tears.

The SC equivalent is the genitive case of the definite form of the adjective used independently; in the case of this one's, that one's the equivalent is the genitive of ovaj and onaj; another possibility is the SC possessive pronoun.

(50SCa); ... jadna gospodja ... otac ove joj je okrenuo ledja.

(50SCb) ... njen otac ...

(51SC) Oči malenih napuniše se suzama.

Since one is the regular equivalent of jedan when used as a number, SC learners might make mistakes by failing to use one in other situations where English requires it, particularly in instances involving the indefinite pronoun one and the prop-word one.

NOTE

1. In modern usage it is used without the indefinite article
   a. I always was one to keep a secret.
      Uvijek sam bila sklona čuvanju tajni.
      Uvijek sam voljela čuvati tajne.

Midhat Ridjanović (University of Sarajevo)

EXCLAMATORY SENTENCES WITH LINKING VERBS IN ENGLISH AND SERBO-CROATIAN

1.0 For the purpose od the present analysis we will divide exclamatory sentences with linking verbs into four groups on the basis of the following two criteria: a) whether or not they begin with what or how (we will henceforth refer to those which do as "wh- exclamatory sentences"), and b) whether the linking verb used is be or some other. The four groups will be assigned Roman numbers on the basis of the following feature matrix:

	wh-	be
I	+	+
II	+	-
III	-	+
IV	-	-

(A '-' in the be column refers to the use of a linking verb other than be.)

2.0 Here are some examples of the first group (group I) of exclamatory sentences:

(1) What a beautiful picture (this is)!

(1aSC) Što je (kako je, ala[1] je) ovo lijepa slika!

(1bSC) Lijepe li slike!

(2) What awful weather (this is)!

(2aSC) Što je (kako je, ala je) ovo užasno vrijeme!

(3) What a fool I was to trust him!

(3SC) Što sam (baš sam, ala sam, kakva sam) bio budala što sam mu povjerovao!

(4) How beautiful this picture is!

(4aSC) Kako je (samo) lijepa ova slika!

(4bSC) Kako je (samo) ova slika lijepa!

(4cSC) Što je (ala je) lijepa ova slika!

(5) How silly of me (it is/was) to suppose that!

(5SC) Kako sam (samo) (bio) glup da to pretpostavim!

(6) How silly of me to have supposed that!

(6SC) Kako sam (baš sam) glup da sam (što sam) to pretpostavio!

2.1 Before we discuss contrastive implications of the above examples, we must point out that most E wh- exclamatory sentences are now felt as slightly old-fashioned and therefore more appropriate to literary and formal styles of expression.

2.2 The differences between the E and SC examples in group I reveal as the most important contrastive datum the fact that the SC što, baš, ala, and kako corresponding to E what and how are obligatorily followed by any enclitic(s) that may occur in the sentence, in keeping with the rules about the placement of enclitics in SC. The E what and how, on the other hand, must be followed by the noun and the adjective phrase respectively, the only possible determiner of the noun phrase being the indefinite article with singular count nouns and zero with all others, in keeping with the general rules about the use of articles with predicate nouns linked to the subject by class-membership be. This difference of obligatory ordering of grammatical elements in the two languages may give rise to mistakes like *What is this picture beautiful! or, perhaps less likely, *What is this beautiful picture!, and *How is beautiful this picture! or *How is picture beautiful!.

2.3 Other possible mistakes should also be traceable to differences of word order, since the E pattern is quite rigid, while in SC the words following the initial šta, baš, ala, or kako plus any enclitic(s) may be ordered in many different ways without a significant change of meaning. (There are certain limitations on the placement of demonstrative pronouns and some other function words, but otherwise the word order seems to be almost free, except that the exclamatory word must always come first.)

2.4 It is to be expected that foreign learners of E will first master the structure with the indefinite article after what (what a + NP) rather than with zero article in the same place, because of the higher frequency of occurrence of the former structure. They will then tend to extend the 'what a...' sequence to cases where no article is needed, and produce something like *What a nice hair she has!. This happens especially if the noun in question is not, to them, a clear case of a mass noun (as are water, sand, milk, etc. corresponding to the so-called "material nouns" in SC), or if it is a count noun according to the 'logic' of the learner's own language (as are advice and information for SC learners of E).

2.5 The contrastive observations made so far suggest that the major problems of SC learners in mastering type I of E exclamatory sentences are those of word order and the use or non-use of the indefinite article in sentences beginning with what. To cope with these problems I would propose the following set of graded drills:

	wh-word	indef. art.	Adj.	Noun	Subject+be	Infinitival Phrase
Drill 1	What	a		girl!		
Drill 2	What	a	nice	girl!		

Drill 3 What a nice girl she is/was etc.
Drill 4 What a fool I am/was to trust him!

Drills parallel to these could be made to practice sentences with mass or plural count nouns immediately following what, as well as sentences beginning with how.

2.6 I do not believe that it would be profitable to introduce the students to all of the complex contrastive relationships in this type of exclamatory sentences. Enough careful drilling along the lines suggested in the foregoing paragraph will probably take care of the learning problems involved more efficiently. Learners should, however, be warned that in the case of structures with the verb to be, as in Drills 3 and 4, they must observe the rules governing the correspondence of tenses between the two languages. Besides, they should note the fact that the dependent clause introduced by što in a SC exclamatory sentence such as (3SC) corresponds to the infinitival phrase in E.

2.7 Sentences (5) and (6) and their SC counterparts merit special discussion. Although we can say in SC Lijepo je od Vas... I don't feel comfortable about Kako glupo od mene... and have therefore resorted to a 'freer' translation shown in (5SC) and (6SC). (Other possible translations, of which there may be many, would not be contrastively useful.) My own 'sprachgefühl' suggests that if we had nice instead of silly in (5) and (6) (and, of course, you instead of me), we could use the parallel structure in SC Kako je to lijepo od Vas...; this seems to be possible with other words expressing 'good' qualities, such as ljubazno, pošteno, etc., but rather awkward with words describing 'bad' qualities, such as glupo, ludo, bezobrazno, and the like.

3.0 Let us now look at some examples of type II exclamatory sentences:

(7) What a place this town has become!

(7SC) Kakvo je (samo) (užasno) mjesto postao ovaj grad!

(8) How strange he seems!

(8SC) Kako (što) on izgleda čudan!

(9) How yellow these leaves have turned!

(9SC) Kako je (što je) požutjelo ovo lišće!

3.1 The contrastive grammar of the sentences of the second type is analogous to the grammar of type I sentences outlined in sections 2.1 through 2.7, so that the manner of solving the learning problems involved should be pretty much the same. The use of a 'full' verb instead of only be might, however, sometimes create additional problems. Some of these are inherent in all non-be linking verb structures (such as the problem of the use of adjectives in E and adverbs in SC after "verbs of perceptual effect"), and have been discussed in other Project reports.[2] The problem specific to type II of exclamatory sentences stem mostly from differences of word order. The examples in 3.0 show that the verb, in SC, tends to follow the exclamatory word or structure, thus preceding its complement and the subject of the sentence, unless the latter is a personal pronoun. On the other hand, the E pattern of wh- exclamatory sentences does not permit any changes of order of its grammatical constituents. Therefore, 'direct' translations of the more frequent SC exclamatory patterns, such as might be produced by SC speaking learners of E, would yield ungrammatical sentences in E. It is also to be expected that some learners will produce sentences like *How yellow have these leaves turned!, under the combined influence of the word order in E

interrogative sentences and a possible order in SC exclamatory sentences. Here again, drilling the order of constituents in E in a systematic way while at the same time warning the students of the existence of a variety of order patterns in SC ought to help in remedying any special learning problems that may arise in this group of sentences.

4.0 A contrastive fact that should be pointed out in connection with all wh-exclamatory sentences and the corresponding SC sentences is the systematic occurrence of what with noun phrases and how with adjectives and adverbs in E, as opposed to the possibility of occurrence in SC of što, baš, kako, and ala in almost any grammatical context. (Even (7SC) can be reworded to allow for the use of što, baš, or ala: Što je (baš je, ala je) ovaj grad postao nekakvo mjesto!, with a possible addition of da bog sačuva to emphasize the emotional element in the exclamation.) These discrepancies may cause mistakes like *What beautiful this picture is!. Some learners might even try to render into E the samo that can be used in SC to stress the exclamatory nature of a sentence. They should be warned that the exclamatory samo can be rendered as only in E only in the type of sentence illustrated by:

(10) If only this were my house!
(10SC) Kad bi samo ovo bila moja kuća!

We might call these 'exclamatory if' sentences and warn our students that only must immediately follow if (which is not parallel to the corresponding SC sentences) and that the relationship of verbal tenses in the two languages is the same as with other 'contrary-to-fact' if sentences.

5.0 In the foregoing section it was stated that što, kako, baš, and ala may be used in almost any grammatical context. The 'almost' was necessary because there is one context in which none of the four words can be used. This is the structure consisting only of the exclamatory word and the noun phrase, as in:

(11) What power!
(11aSC) Kakva sila! or Kakve li sile!
(11bSC) Koja sila! or Koje li sile!

As shown by these examples, the exclamatory words admitted in a SC structure of this type are kakav and - perhaps less commonly - koji, each of which has to agree in gender and number with the noun phrase that it modifies. However, as soon as we want to add another constituent to such a sentence, it becomes possible to use što, baš, or ala:

(12) What power that is (was)!
(12SC) Što je (baš je, ala je) to (bila) sila!

In this, as in any other sentence in which the exclamatory word is to be followed by an NP, it is still possible to use kakav or koji, although što, baš, or ala may be preferred since kakav and koji introduce ambiguity based on a possible interrogative interpretation.[3] The occurrence of kakav or koji in some exclamatory sentences in SC might cause some difficulties to those among Yugoslav learners of E who are too conscious of their own language while trying to speak E, but, on the whole, it should not present a serious obstacle once the learner has mastered the basic patterns of E exclamatory sentences.

6.0 The contrastive relations of sentences in both group I and II are characterized by a large measure of variety and 'freedom' in SC as compared with a more 'orderly' system in E. As always in such cases, it is the switch

from the orderly system to one with greater latitude and, consequently, more rules that is more difficult to make in a learning situation than the other way round. If the target language is the one with the more 'orderly' system, such a situation indicates, in my opinion, a pedagogical approach which will try to ignore as much as possible the confusing variety of the corresponding system in the source language. Therefore, I think that the system of E wh- exclamatory sentences should be taught to SC speaking learners mainly through a series of graded exercises as illustrated in section 2.5, and with only an occasional warning of possible interference from SC.

7.0 The following examples serve to illustrate type III exclamatory sentences:

(13) Isn't she nice!; Nice, isn't she?
(13SC) Zar nije (nije li) fina (simpatična)!

(14) She is really nice!
(14SC) Stvarno je (zaista je, baš je) fina!

(15) This is awful weather (isn't it)!; Awful weather, isn't it!
(15SC) Užasna li vremena (zar ne)!

(16) Was that ever a bad movie![4]
(16aSC) Što je to bio loš film!
(16bSC) Uh, lošeg li filma!

7.1 A common feature of all the E examples in 7.0 is that, with a different intonation in spoken language, and without the exclamation mark in writing, they could have other than exclamatory meaning. The context, both situational and verbal, will in both cases help determine the meaning intended. Still, it seems that in teaching this type of E exclamatory sentences to SC learners, it would be helpful to devote some attention to the more salient features of the intonation of these sentences, without, however, going into the theory. The

teacher could simply make the student repeat after him sentences of this type (preferably used in typical contexts), while the students attempt to imitate his or her intonation as closely as possible.

7.2 Of the E examples in 7.0 only (13) and (14) have contrastively useful translation equivalents; these show that SC learners would have little difficulty in learning the kind of E exclamatory sentences illustrated by (13) and (14), provided the students have already mastered the formation of the interrogative-negative form and are aware of the emphatic meaning of the word really. More attention should be devoted to sentences such as (15) and (16), since they have no structural counterparts in SC and should therefore be taught as 'idioms' by a direct-method procedure.

8.0 The following examples illustrate the last group in our classification of exclamatory sentences with linking verbs:

(17) This town has become such a place / such a beauty / such a pigsty!

(17SC) Ovaj grad je postao tako neprijatno mjesto / takva ljepotica / / takav svinjac !

(18) She has become such a nice person!

(18SC) Postala je tako prijatna osoba!

(19) He seems so strange!

(19SC) Izgleda tako čudan!

(20) Does this ever taste bad!

(20SC) Što je (baš je, ala je) ovo neukusno!

8.1 (19) and (19SC) show that the E exclamatory structure so + Adj has a word-for-word translation equivalent in SC, namely tako + Adj, which makes for easy learning in both directions. However, such a + N, as in (17), has a more intricate contrastive relationship with SC: if the noun in such a

structure connotes a value judgement (whether 'pleasant' or 'unpleasant'), then the corresponding SC structure will be formally analogous to the E one, i.e. takav +N; if the E noun, taken in isolation, is totally neutral with regard to any possible value judgement, then the whole structure will have a 'negative' meaning in E, and will have to be rendered in SC by tako + an adjective expressing an unpleasant reaction + the corresponding noun. Pedagogical implications of these contrastive facts suggest - apart from the necessity of developing a sense with the learners for a distinction between nouns charged with 'negative' versus those with 'positive' connotations - the need for practising the structure such a + a 'neutral' noun, bearing in mind the 'unpleasant' connotations of exclamatory sentences with such structures and their differing SC renderings.

8.2 Contrastively, sentence (20) belongs in the same class as (16) and should be handled pedagogically in the same way (see section 7.2).

NOTES

1. Ala is predominently used in eastern parts of the SC speech community.

2. See V. Ivir's "Predicative Patterns of English Adjectives and Their Contrastive Correspondents in Serbo-Croatian" in R. Filipović, ed., The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian - English Contrastive Project, Reports 2, Zagreb 1970, pp. 10-55, and my own "Linking Verb + Complement in English and Serbo-Croatian," ibid., pp. 77-93.

3. This is so in my own idiolect and, I believe, in the type of standard SC predominently used in Bosnia-Hercegovina. In the western variant of standard SC, in which što is used also as an interrogative word meaning what where other types of SC use šta, a sentence like Što je to sila can also be interpreted as either an exclamation or a question, although in the spoken language the intonation will in most cases indicate the intended meaning.

4. This type of exclamatory sentences is characteristic of American English and is only recently gaining ground in Britain as well.

Mira Vlatković (University of Zagreb)

EXPRESSIONS OF SIMULTANEITY IN ENGLISH AND SERBO-CROATIAN

1.1. The present paper attempts to list expressions describing concurrent actions and states in E and SC[1]. These are not limited to verbal forms only, but include adverbial and participial adjuncts and co-ordinate and subordinate clauses. (A).

1.2. A special case in this general division is the co-occurrence of an action its verbalization. (B)

1.3. Contrastively interesting is the use of the preterite as English equivalent of the present tense in SC which has the meaning of concurrence, while in E such a present can be employed with certain limitations only. (C)

A. Concurrence of Events

2.1. Actions occurring at the same time may be divided into those which are of approximately the same duration (Jespersen's co-extensive actions and states[2]) and those in which one event represents a 'frame' for the other[3]; the latter occurs while the former is in progress and may, but need not, interrupt or stop it.

2.2. Co-ordinate clauses and independent sentences can be used in arrangements indicating concurrent actions. They may contain adverbial adjuncts of time to emphasize time relations. Combinations of two continuous tenses, two simple tenses, or one simple, the other continuous are all found in descriptions of such situations.

(1) The sun is shining, the bees are humming, the birds are singing, the fruit is ripening. Summer is here.

(1SC) Sunce sije, pčele zuje, ptice pjevaju, voće dozrijeva. Ljeto je.

(2) Open emotion replaces ego defense; honesty and love replace sophistication.

(2SC) Otvoreni osjećaji nadomještavaju obranu vlastitog "ja"; poštenje i ljubav nadomještavaju profinjenost.

Both the continuous and the simple forms in E are rendered as SC imperfective verbs. This, however, does not seem to be the most common of cases, simply because descriptions of this kind are not too frequent in everyday communication. A more commonplace instance of roughly the same usage of the continuous forms would be the answer to the question: What are you /they/ doing?

(3) Mary is playing in the yard, John is reading a history book, and I am trying to get my work done.

(3SC) Marica se igra u dvorištu, Ivica čita neku knjigu iz historije, a ja nastojim završiti posao.

If the question referred to a past or a future period, similar usage might be observed.

(4) It was a lovely summer afternoon. The sun was shining, the bees were humming, etc.

(4SC) Bilo je krasno ljetno popodne. Sunce je sjalo, pčele su zujale, itd.

While in this case only imperfective forms are possible in SC, E would allow simple forms: the sun shone, the bees hummed, the birds sang, the fruit ripened (?).

A straightforward question about past activities may require a different treatment:

(5) Mary played in the garden, John read a history book, and I tried to get my homework done.

(5SC) Marica se igrala u vrtu, Ivica je čitao neku knjigu iz povijesti, a ja sam nastojala završiti zadaću.

As can be seen, this time the SC imperfective verbs are equivalent to the E simple forms. But here again, continuous forms are possible. The reaction of the hearer depends largely on the attitude of the questioner, i.e. if the question is formulated as 'What did you all do .. ?' the answer will probably be: 'Mary played..' If the question asked was 'What were you doing?' the answer would probably be 'Mary was playing'. However, if the second speaker wants to emphasize the completion of e.g. the reading, his only choice will be: 'John read a history book', and the whole sentence then would be: 'Mary was playing ..., John read a history book'.

2.3. Introduction of adverbials like e.g. at the same time, at that time, all the time, meanwhile, etc. would not call for any change in the use of verbal forms.

2.4. Subordinate clauses, especially those beginning with while, whilst, as, when, whenever, as long as, (as time clauses) and with while, whereas, no matter .. (as clauses of contrast) are the ones that come first to our minds when we think of concurrent events, because they indicate simultaneity. Combinations of the simple and the continuous tenses are not restricted in English. While it is possible to use either two continuous or two simple verbal forms in a sentence introduced by while in a temporal clause, similar combinations are found when while stands for contrast.

(6) While we wait / are waiting, we might as well do something useful.

(6SC) Dok čekamo mogli bismo učiniti i nešto korisno.

The usage of simple tenses in sentences constructed to mean "at the same time" is explained by a certain economy of language, where the continuous form is felt as redundant after a conjunction showing simultaneity, i.e. indicating the duration of one action with another.

It may be necessary to discuss the usage of the conjunction as. It means while and therefore should not be used to denote an action preceding, or finished before that indicated by the verb of the main clause. Let us examine the following pairs of sentences:

(7a) While they were coming out of the shop, father grumbled.

(7b)? While they came out, father grumbled.

(7aSC) (7bSC) Dok su izlazili iz dućana, otac je gundjao.

(8a) As they came out of the shop, father grumbled..

(8b) As they were coming out of the shop, father grumbled..

(8aSC) (8bSC) Dok su izlazili iz dućana, otac je gundjao...

(9a) When they were coming out of the shop, father grumbled..

(9b)? When they came out of the shop, father grumbled..

(9aSC) (9bSC) Kad (Dok) su izlazili iz dućana, otac je gundjao..

(10a) When they came out of the shop they saw the accident.

(10b) When they had come out of the shop, they saw the accident.

(10aSC) (10bSC) Kad su izašli iz dućana, vidjeli su saobraćajnu nesreću.

(11) When they had come out, they began to think ...

(11SC) Kad su već izašli, počeli su razmišljati..

Examples (7a) and (7b) indicate that the actions are simultaneous. The simple tense, which in (7b) does not seem to be common, may be acceptable with the verb 'be': All his property was sequestered while he was in jail[4]. In examples (8a) and (8b) both tense forms are equally acceptable, and certainly mean the same thing, i.e. the concurrence of the actions denoted by the verbs in the main and the subordinate clauses. Few grammars give any specific hints as to which of the verbal forms - the simple or the continuous - is preferable. One[5], however, states that 'as is used when we are thinking of the course of an action. For that reason the verb in an adverb clause beginning with as is generally in the Continuous Tense.' This is opposite to what can be concluded about the tense forms in as-time clauses found in the Brown Corpus (the half that was used in the Project's concordancing) where out of 250 instances only 3 are in the continuous. The verbs in question are: as she was walking, as these Swiss were moving, and, as they were passing. Eckersley's[6] statement might be modified to state that the verb in an as-clause is in the continuous when we are pointing out the course or progress of an action. The fact that the three verbs from the Brown Corpus are all verbs of motion would not help us much, because the structures 'as he came' or 'as he went' are common. The SC learner of E would find it difficult to get rid of his 'imperfective' heritage and its association with the continuous tenses in E, so that spontaneously produced sentences containing as with simple tenses are rather rare in our experience.

The subsequent pair of sentences, (9a) and (9b) can perhaps be interpreted as meaning simultaneous actions. Undoubtedly concurrent actions, however, are indicated only by (9a), because (9b) can be taken as denoting a previous action as also does the pluperfect in (10b).

2.5. Examples with as have brought us closer to the discussion of frame actions, i.e. one or more actions in progress when another takes place. The actions concur at one moment only, regardless of whether the frame action is continued or not. This hardly requires illustration by examples, since such situations are always used to exemplify the usage of the past continuous tenses in E.

2.6. Examples shown by Jespersen[7] point out an interesting interplay of continuous and simple forms in the case of a habitual action regarded as the frame of another non-habitual action. Only one verb is in the continuous form:

(12) Nobody knew how Dr Raste talked....when he was not talking professionally.

(12SC) Nitko nije znao kako Dr Raste govori kad govori izvan službe.

(13) He looked at her repeatedly when she was not looking.

(13SC) Gledao ju je uvijek ponovno kad ona nije znala (ne bi vidjela?)

Whereas the usual frame action is expressed by the continuous, here with the habitual action serving as the frame, the specific action is put in the continuous. All this may agree with the regular usage of tenses for habitual vs. specific (single) actions, but one must bear in mind the stylistic play in the above examples.

2.7. Prepositional phrases are yet another device in the expression of concurrent actions. In this case the prepositional phrase may stand as a framework for a number of sequential and habitual events or actions, or it may be the frame for only one. The range naturally depends on the length of the period, i.e. the lexical meaning of a given phrase.

(14) During my stay in Britain, I was often invited to accompany the old lady on her visits to her various cousins and friends .... The old lady invariably let me in first..

(14SC) Za vrijeme mog boravka u Britaniji, često su me pozivali da pratim staru gospodju u posjete njenim kojekakvim rodjacima i prijateljima... Stara je gospodja uvijek mene puštala da prvi udjem...

Nothing would change in the structure and usage of the tenses if the frame was expressed by a temporal clause introduced by while or when.

2.7. Participial adjuncts can also be included in the list of expressions describing simultaneity. Combinations with as-clauses are not infrequent.

(15) He hurried back, skipping as he went.

(15SC) Žurio se (požurio se) natrag poskakujući putem.

The present participle can be introduced by the conjunctions while or when.

(16) While flying over the Channel, the pilot saw what he thought to be a meteorite.[8]

(16SC) Dok je letio preko Kanala pilotu se učinilo da vidi meteorit.

2.8. A structure describing 'attendant circumstances' should also appear in our list of concurrent events. It is a kind of free adjunct (with or without a verbal form) introduced by with:

(17) It's ever so pretty, with all the trees coming out.

(17SC) Tu je tako lijepo sada kad sve to drveće pupa.

(18) We can't have a party with the man dying next door.

(18SC) Ne možemo sad pozvati društvo dok taj čovjek umire u susjedstvu.

(19) At five o'clock the following day old Jolyon sat alone, a cigar between his lips

(19SC) Slijedećeg dana u pet sati stari je Jolyon sjedio sam s cigarom u ustima /držeći cigaru/.

Free adjuncts without an expressed verbal form, as in (19) have with optionally.

B. Concurrence of Event and Its Verbalization

3. So far we have discussed instances of concurrent events, all of which were reported, either by one taking part in the activities or a speaker outside. We are turning now to those actions which are concurrent with their verbalization.

3.1. The most obvious occurrence is the demonstration accompanied by a running commentary (various kinds: laboratory experiments, cooking, conjuror's tricks, TV and radio commentaries have been dealt with elsewhere[10]). While such actions are often described by simple tenses there is a difference between the exact meaning of such an event reported in the continuous and in the simple tense. 'Exact meaning' should be understood to explain the point of reference. If our TV man says:

(20) Reed kicks the ball

it is much as if he had said:

(21) Reed /has/ kicked the ball

i.e. the event reported belongs to the time sphere 'past'.

If his sentence is:

(22) Reed is kicking the ball

it means:

(23) Reed is preparing to kick the ball,[11]

i.e. the commentator is anticipating the player's obvious course of action. By the time he has pronounced his words, the act of kicking may already belong to the past. This is true only if the verb itself denotes a momentary action. In instances like 'he carries the ball' or 'he is carrying the ball' both expressions should be understood as conveying the same meaning, 'on drži loptu i trči'. Similarly if one says 'I hear it thundering' it means as much as 'I heard it thundering'[12] while if the sentence is formulated as 'It is thundering', it should be understood that I heard it once (at least) and expect more to come.

C. The E Preterite vs. the SC Present

4. The role played by the E preterite (often called the back-shifted present) in reported speech and related structures (object clauses) is of special interest for SC learners of E.

The extensive use of the historical present in SC is a serious obstacle on the road towards good English. Maretić[13] extends the usage of the historical present to instances of 'relative past', i.e. when 'it is real past with reference to the time of speaking, but it is present with reference to the time spoken about'[14]

(24) Nadjoh da je grča od smrti.

(24E) I found that it was bitterer than death.

4.1. The following is an illustration of the structure we have mentioned:

(25) I knew (said, thought) that he was ill.

(25SC) Znao sam /rekao, mislio/ da je bolestan.

Once the time sphere has been indicated in SC, the historical present assumes the function of concurrence of events. What confuses the students is the possibility of retaining the present tense in E if the time sphere extends to and includes now, or if the event expressed belongs to the category known as 'eternal or general truth'. On the other hand it is possible to find instances in which the preterite stands for an anterior past event even if reported.[15]

(26) Dinosaurs lived in California in the Cretaceous Period.
She knew that dinosaurs lived in California in the Cretaceous Period.

(26SC) Dinosauri su živjeli u Kaliforniji u razdoblju krede.
Znala je da su dinosauri živjeli u Kaliforniji u razdoblju krede.

4.2. The verbal forms in E easily assuming the function of simultaneity are the infinitive and the present participle; the patterning might to a certain extent be parallelled with that of the SC present. The structure in question is the so-called 'accusative with infinitive or participle' after the verbs of perception:

(27) We heard them come / coming down the stairs.

(27SC) Čuli smo ih kako su sišli / silaze niz stepenice.

The actions expressed by the infinitive in E and the perfekt in SC should be taken as simultaneous with the verb of the main clause, with emphasis on the completion of the action.

5. Interference problems encountered in expressions of simultaneity are probably due to the underestimation of the importance of time sphere in English. This can be proved by the fact that students at a more advanced level seldom make errors in substituting (for purposes of drill) correct tense forms in isolated sentences, but perform less satisfactorily if assigned a connected

passage. Their SC time reference habit easily catches and retains those exceptional 'rules' about the present not being shifted in a number of cases listed in grammars. Convincing arguments supported by numerous examples are necessary before the student is made aware of just where he went wrong.

NOTES

1. The term 'simultaneity' in linguistics should not be associated with Einstein's notions of simultaneity. Linguistic considerations need not be based on principles of theoretical physics, because this would mean correlating two systems - the physicist's 'objective reality' with subjective linguistic behaviour.

2. O. Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part IV, Syntax, Third Volume, London, 1954. 187.

3. Ibid.

4. C.C. Fries, American English Grammar, New York, 1940. 236.

5. C.E. Eckersley and J.M. Eckersley, A Comprehensive English Grammar for Foreign Students, London, 1960. 338.

6. Ibid.

7. O. Jespersen, ibid.

8. B.D. Graver, Advanced English Practice, Second Edition, London, 1971. 177.

9. R. W. Zandwoort, A Handbook of English Grammar, London, 1958. 210

10. M. Vlatković, "Elements of Aspectives in English", in A. Reports 1 The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian - English Contrastive Project, Edited by R. Filipović, Zagreb, 1969.

11. This difference has been pointed out by Wayles Brown.

12. W. E. Bull, Time Tense, and the Verb, Los Angelos, 1968. 8.

13. T. Maretić, Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnoga jezika. Treće izdanje, Zagreb, 1963. 610-611.

14. Ibid.

15. Suggestion and example by Wayles Browne.